

Charles Sumner died, or whether all who sit here now put together, have done a more important single service to the country than he did in securing the passage of the resolution which pledged us to deal with Cuba according to the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

You also, my imperialistic friends, have had your ideals and your sentimentalities. One is that the flag shall never be hauled down where it has once floated. Another is that you will not talk or reason with a people with arms in their hands. Another is that sovereignty over an unwilling people may be bought with gold. And another is that sovereignty may be got by force of arms, as the booty of battle or the spoils of victory.

What has been the practical statesmanship which comes from your ideals and your sentimentalities? You have wasted six hundred millions of treasure. You have sacrificed nearly 10,000 American lives—the flower of our youth. You have devastated provinces. You have slain uncounted thousands of the people you desire to benefit. You have established reconcentration camps. Your generals are coming home from their harvest, bringing their sheaves with them, in the shape of other thousands of sick and wounded and insane to drag out miserable lives, wrecked in body and mind. You make the American flag in the eyes of a numerous people the emblem of sacrilege in Christian churches, and of the burning of human dwellings, and of the horror of the water torture. Your practical statesmanship, which disdains to take George Washington and Abraham Lincoln or the soldiers of the Revolution or of the civil war as models, has looked in some cases to Spain for your example. I believe—nay, I know—that in general our officers and soldiers are humane. But in some cases they have carried on your warfare with a mixture of American ingenuity and Castilian cruelty.

Your practical statesmanship has succeeded in converting a people who three years ago were ready to kiss the hem of the garment of the American and to welcome him as a liberator, who thronged after your men when they landed on those islands with benediction and gratitude, into sullen and irreconcilable enemies, possessed of a hatred which centuries can not eradicate.

The practical statesmanship of the Declaration of Independence and the Golden Rule would have cost nothing but a few kind words. They would have bought for you the great title of liberator and benefactor, which your fathers won for your country in the South American Republics and in Japan and which you have won in Cuba. They would have bought for you the undying gratitude of a great and free people and the undying glory which belongs to the name of liberator. That people would have felt for you as Japan felt for you when she declared last summer that she owed everything to the United States of America.

What have your ideals cost you, and what have they bought for you?

1. For the Philippine Islands you have had to repeal the Declaration of Independence.

For Cuba you have had to reaffirm it and give it new luster.

2. For the Philippine Islands you have had to convert the Monroe doctrine into a doctrine of mere selfishness.

For Cuba you have acted on it and vindicated it.

3. In Cuba you have got the eternal gratitude of a free people.

In the Philippine Islands you have got the hatred and sullen submission of a subjugated people.

4. From Cuba you have brought home nothing but glory.

From the Philippines you have brought home nothing of glory.

5. In Cuba no man thinks of counting the cost. The few soldiers who came home from Cuba wounded or sick carry about their wounds and their pale faces as if they were medals of honor. What soldier glories in a wound or an empty sleeve which he got in the Philippines?

6. The conflict in the Philippines has cost you \$600,000,000, thousands of American soldiers—the flower of your youth—the health and sanity of thousands more, and hundreds of thousands of Filipinos slain.

Another price we have paid as the result of your practical statesmanship. We have sold out the right, the old American right, to speak out the sympathy which is in our hearts for people who are desolate and oppressed everywhere on the face of the earth. Has there ever been a contest between power and the spirit of liberty, before that now going on in South Africa, when American Senators held their peace because they thought they were under an obligation to the nation in the wrong for not interfering with us? I have heard that it turned out that we had no great reason for gratitude of that kind. But I myself heard an American Senator, a soldier of the civil war, declare in this Chamber that, while he sympathized with the Boers, he did not say so because of our obligation to Great Britain for not meddling with us in the war with Spain. Nothing worse than that was said of us in the old slavery days. A great English poet before the civil war, in a poem entitled "The Curse," taunted us by say-

ing that we did not dare to utter our sympathy with freedom so long as we were the holders of slaves. I remember, after fifty years, the sting and shame I felt in my youth when that was uttered. I had hoped that we had got rid of that forever before 1865.

Ye shall watch while kings conspire
Round the people's smouldering fire,
And, warm for your part,
Shall never dare, O, shame!
To utter the thought into flame
Which burns at your heart.

Ye shall watch while nations strive
With the bloodhounds—die or survive—
Drop faint from their jaws,
Or throttle them backward to death,
And only under your breath
Shall ye bless the cause.

Sometimes men are affected by particular instances who are not impressed by statistics of great numbers.

Sterne's starling in its cage has moved more hearts than were ever stirred by census tables.

Let me take two examples out of a thousand with which to contrast the natural result of the doctrine of your fathers with yours.

I do not think there ever was a more delightful occurrence in the history of Massachusetts since the Puritans or the Pilgrims landed there, than the visit to Harvard two years ago of the Cuban teachers to the Harvard Summer School. The old University put on her best apparel for the occasion. The guests were manly boys and fair girls, making you think of Tennyson's sweet girl graduates, who came to sit at the feet of old Harvard to learn something which they could teach to their pupils, and to carry back to their country and teach their own children undying gratitude to the great Republic. It was one of the most delightful lessons in all history of the gratitude of a people to its liberator, and of the affection of the liberator-Republic to the people it had delivered. Was there ever a more fitting subject for poetry or for art than the venerable President Eliot, surrounded with his staff of learned teachers and famous scholars, the foremost men in the Republic of letters and science, as he welcomed them, these young men and women, to the delights of learning and the blessings of liberty?

Contrast this scene with another. It is all you have to show, that you have brought back, so far, from the Philippine Islands. You have no grateful youth coming to sit at your feet. You do not dare to bring here even a friendly Filipino to tell you, with unfettered lips, what his people think of you, or what they want of you. I read the other day in a Nebraska paper a terrible story of the passage through Omaha of a carload of maniacs from the Philippine Islands.

The story, I believe, has been read in the Senate. I telegraphed to Omaha to the editor of a paper, of high reputation; I believe, a zealous supporter of the policy of Imperialism, to learn if the story was authentic. I am told in reply, and I am glad to know it, that the picture is sensational and exaggerated, but the substantial fact is confirmed that that load of young soldiers passed through that city lately, as other like cargoes have passed through before, maniacs and broken in mental health as the result of service in the Philippine Islands.

It is no answer to tell me that such horrors exist everywhere; that there are other maniacs at St. Elizabeth, and that every State asylum is full of them. Those unhappy beings have been visited, without any man's fault, by the mysterious Providence of God, or if their affliction comes from any man's fault it is our duty to make it known and to hold the party guilty responsible. It is a terrible picture that I have drawn. It is a picture of men suffering from the inevitable result which every reasonable man must have anticipated of the decisions made in this Chamber when we elected to make war for the principle of despotism instead of a policy of peace, in accordance with the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. President, every one of these maniacs, every one of the many like freights of horror that come back to us from the Philippine Islands, every dead soldier, every wounded or wrecked soldier was once an American boy, the delight of some American home, fairer and nobler in his young promise, as we like to think, than any other the round world over. Ah! Mr. President, it was not \$20,000,000 that we paid as the price of sovereignty. It was the souls of these boys of ours that entered into the cost. When you determined by one vote to ratify the Spanish treaty; when you determined by one vote to defeat the Bacon resolution; when you declared, in the McEnery resolution, that we would dispose of that people as might be for the interest of the United States; when the Senator from Wisconsin said we would not talk to a people who had arms in their hands, although they begged that there should be no war, and that we would at least hear them; when some of you went about the country declaring that the flag never should be hauled down where it once floated, you did not know, because in your excitement and haste

Mr. Ford adds, after citing the Russian minister's communication:

This gave Adams his opening. If the Emperor set up to be the mouth-piece of Divine Providence it would be well to intimate that this country did not recognize the language spoken and had a destiny of its own, also under the guidance of Divine Providence. If Alexander could exploit his political principles, those of a brutal repressive policy, the United States could show that another system of government, remote and separate from European traditions and administration, could give rise to a new and more active political principle—the consent of the governed—between which and the Emperor there could not exist even a sentimental sympathy. (Ford, p. 15.)

So, Mr. President, if you have your own way, and keep on in the path you are treading, you have not only repealed the Declaration of Independence, but you have left for the Monroe doctrine only the principle of brutal selfishness. You have taken from that doctrine, which is the chief glory of this country, from the time of the treaty of peace in 1783 till the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln in 1861, its foundation in righteousness and freedom, and you found it only upon selfishness. You say not that it is right, but only that it is for our interest. If hereafter you go to war for it—if you have your way—it will not be for the glory of the liberator or for the principle on which the Republic is founded. You will only have Ancient Pistol's solace:

I shall sutler be unto the camp,
And profits will accrue.

John Quincy Adams lived to see the great doctrine he had been taught from his cradle, which he had drawn in with his mother's milk, derided and trampled under foot by a people drunk with conquest and dazzled by military glory. He lived to see the President take soldiers and not statesmen for his counselors. He lived to see slavery entrenched in every department of the Government—in the White House, in court, in Congress, in trade, and in the pulpit. But he never wavered nor faltered in his sublime faith. He faced the stormy and turbulent waves of the House of Representatives at eighty. He took for his motto: *Alteri Seculo*—a motto which his son inscribed at his burial place at Quincy.

But the new age came sooner even than the faith of John Quincy Adams had predicted. In less than thirteen years from his death, Abraham Lincoln, whom the people sent to the White House, had declared on his way thither the sublime doctrine of the consent of the governed to be that on which the Republic is founded, and for which, if need be, he was willing to be assassinated. I think, therefore, modestly I hope and humbly, that the men who differ from their political associates, and even from majorities, may find something of consolation and something of hope in the company of John Quincy Adams and in the company of Abraham Lincoln.

When we ratified the treaty of Paris we committed ourselves to one experiment in Cuba and another in the Philippine Islands. We had said already that Cuba of right ought to be free and independent. So when in the treaty Spain abandoned her sovereignty the title of Cuba became at once complete. We were only to stay there to keep order until we could hand over Cuba to a government her people had chosen and established.

By the same treaty we bought the Philippine Islands for \$20,000,000 and declared and agreed that Congress shall dispose of them. So, according to those who held that treaty valid, it became the duty of the President to reduce them to submission, and of Congress to govern them.

Here the two doctrines are brought into sharp antagonism.

In Cuba, of right, just government, according to you, must rest on the consent of the governed. Her people are to "institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

In the Philippine Islands a government is to be instituted by a power 10,000 miles away, to be in the beginning a despotism, established by military power.

It is to be a despotism where there is treason without an overt act and elections, if they have them, without political debate, and schools where they can not teach liberty. It is to be established by military power, and to be such, to use the language of the McEnery resolution, such as shall seem "for the interest of the United States."

You have given both doctrines a three years' trial. Three years is sometimes a very long time and sometimes a very short time in human affairs. I believe the whole life of the Savior, after He first made His divine mission known, lasted but three years. Three years has wrought a mighty change in Cuba, and it has wrought a mighty change in the Philippine Islands. We have had plenty of time to try both experiments.

President Roosevelt a day or two ago very truly and eloquently recited the story of what we had done for Cuba, and claimed, and surely he was right, that it was one of the chief glories of the Republic in all our glorious history. When he had finished the recital he said, "That is one deed consummated to-day; and now for the other." I do not believe that brave and honest man will con-

tent himself to match this glorious instance of self-denial and good faith, which has so stirred his enthusiasm, by putting against it the gift of \$200,000 from the Treasury to relieve suffering Martini-que, a gift which, in proportion to our resources, is as if a man with \$60,000 had given a two-dollar bill. There can be but one other deed which his Administration can do which can match the glories of the liberation of Cuba, and that will be the liberation of the Philippine Islands.

Now, what has each cost you, and what has each profited you?

In stating this account of profit and loss I hardly know which to take up first, principles and honor or material interests—I should have known very well which to have taken up first down to three years ago—what you call the sentimental, the ideal, the historical on the right side of the column; the cost or the profit in honor or shame and in character and in principle and moral influence, in true national glory; or the practical side, the cost in money and gain, in life and health, in wasted labor, in diminished national strength, or in prospects of trade and money getting.

I should naturally begin where our fathers used to begin. But somehow the things get so inextricably blended that we can not keep them separate. This world is so made that you can not keep honesty, and sound policy, and freedom, and material property, and good government, and the consent of the governed, apart. Men who undertake to make money by cheating pay for it by failure in business. If you try to keep order by military despotism you suffer from it by revolution and by barbarity in war. If a strong people try to govern a weak one against its will, the home government will get despotic, too. You can not maintain despotism in Asia and a republic in America. If you try to deprive even a savage or a barbarian of his just rights you can never do it without becoming a savage or a barbarian yourself.

Gentlemen talk about sentimentalities, about idealism. They like practical statesmanship better. But, Mr. President, this whole debate for the last four years has been a debate between two kinds of sentimentality. There has been practical statesmanship in plenty on both sides. Your side have carried their sentimentalities and ideals out in your practical statesmanship. The other side have tried and begged to be allowed to carry theirs out in practical statesmanship also. On one side have been these sentimentalities. They were the ideals of the fathers of the Revolutionary time, and from their day down till the day of Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner was over. The sentimentalities were that all men in political right were created equal; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are instituted to secure that equality; that every people—not every scattering neighborhood or settlement without organic life, not every portion of a people who may be temporarily discontented, but the political being that we call a people—has the right to institute a government for itself and to lay its foundation on such principles and organize its powers in such form as to it and not to any other people shall seem most likely to effect its safety and happiness. Now, a good deal of practical statesmanship has followed from these ideals and sentimentalities. They have builded forty-five States on firm foundations. They have covered South America with republics. They have kept despotism out of the Western Hemisphere. They have made the United States the freest, strongest, richest of the nations of the world. They have made the word republic a name to conjure by the round world over. By their virtue the American flag—beautiful as a flower to those who love it; terrible as a meteor to those who hate it—floats everywhere over peaceful seas, and is welcomed everywhere in friendly ports as the emblem of peaceful supremacy and sovereignty in the commerce of the world.

Has there been any practical statesmanship in our dealing with Cuba? You had precisely the same problem in the East and in the West. You knew all about conditions in Cuba. There has been no lack of counselors to whisper in the ear of the President and Senate and House the dishonorable counsel that we should hold on to Cuba, without regard to our pledges or our principles, and that the resolution of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] was a great mistake. "Yeshall not surely die," said the serpent—

Squat like a toad, close at the ear of Eve.

I do not know how other men may feel, but I think that the statesmen who have had something to do with bringing Cuba into the family of nations, when they look back on their career, that my friends who sit around me, when each comes to look back upon a career of honorable and brilliant public service, will count the share they had in that as among the brightest, the greenest, and the freshest laurels in their crown.

I do not think I could honestly repeat all the compliments which the Senator from Wisconsin is in the habit of paying to the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado has gone against my grain very often, especially when he voted for the Spanish treaty and when his vote defeated the Bacon resolution. But I doubt whether any man who has sat in this Chamber since

governments must rest upon the consent of the governed. That, he declared to be its only foundation, and that so founded it rested upon the eternal principle of righteousness and justice.

A thorough examination has lately been made by an accomplished historical scholar, Mr. Worthington C. Ford, aided by Mr. Charles Francis Adams, grandson of John Quincy Adams, of the unpublished Adams manuscripts at Quincy, the archives of the Department of State, and the papers of President Monroe, lately published by Congress.

I can relate this story in a moment. I think it an important contribution to this debate.

Mr. President, I discussed some time ago, and more than once, this attempt to buy sovereignty with money of a dispossessed tyrant, or to get it as booty or spoils of battle. I showed that it is in contradiction of the great American doctrine that just governments rest only on the consent of the governed—in flat contradiction of the doctrine on which this Government is founded and of the uniform tradition of all our statesmen from 1776 to the adoption of the Spanish treaty. I do not mean to repeat that argument now. It was met by the affirmation that Jefferson disregarded it when we bought Louisiana, and that John Quincy Adams disregarded it when we acquired Florida, and that Abraham Lincoln disregarded it when he put down the rebellion, and that Charles Sumner disregarded it when he urged the purchase of Alaska.

It was never denied that we could acquire territory and that we could govern it after it was acquired. The doctrine was that if the territory be inhabited by that vital and living being we call a people, as distinct from a few scattered and unorganized inhabitants, neither controlling it nor governing themselves, that people have a right to govern themselves and to determine their own destiny after their own fashion. This is the American exposition of the law of nations. Thomas Jefferson never departed from it. He regarded the Louisiana Territory as something not worth taking. He declared that it would not be inhabited for a thousand years. He only wanted New Orleans. The rest of the Territory was forced upon him by Napoleon. There was no people, in the sense of the law of nations, either in New Orleans or in the Louisiana Territory. There was no people there that could make a government or a treaty.

Abraham Lincoln put down the rebellion, because by his and our interpretation of the Constitution we were one people and not two—to which doctrine the Southern people had consented when they adopted the Constitution; and besides, if you had counted the whole people, black and white, there was never a majority on the side of secession in any single Southern State. Sumner again and again declared that there was nothing in Alaska which could be called a people, and that if there were the United States would never be willing to acquire them without their consent; and that we would never take Canada, if we could get it, except with the full approbation of her people. If my friends of the press or in the Senate who still stick to this ten hundred times refuted fallacy are not content, they will never be persuaded, though Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln and Charles Sumner rise from the dead.

I do not wish to detain the Senate by renewing that debate. But I wish to cite a chapter of the history of this country, which shows that your present policy is in contradiction of the Monroe doctrine, as it is in contradiction of the Declaration of Independence. It is well known that John Quincy Adams was the author of the Monroe doctrine. He carried his point over the opposition of the Cabinet and reluctance on the part of the President.

When Canning proposed that the United States join England in asserting that the Holy Alliance should not reduce any South American country under the dominion of Spain, Mr. Adams said that we would not join England, although she asked us to do it. He said we were not to be a little cockboat in the wake of the British man-of-war. He counseled the President, and his advice was taken, that this country should make its declaration to Russia, the head and strength of the Holy Alliance, and he put that declaration expressly and solely on the doctrine of the consent of the governed, affirmed in our Declaration of Independence. He declared that doctrine was a doctrine of absolute right and righteousness.

It will take but a moment to tell the story as it appears in the archives in our Department of State, in the Monroe papers lately published, in Adams's Diary, and in the Adams manuscripts at Quincy, which have been made public within a few days.

In August, September, and October, 1823, there came to the State Department of Washington from Mr. Rush dispatches containing letters from Mr. Canning. These letters suggested designs of the Holy Alliance against the independence of the South American colonies, and proposed cooperation between Great Britain and the United States against that alliance.

President Monroe asked the advice of Mr. Jefferson and Mr.

Madison, and suggested that we should make it known that we should view an attack by the European powers upon the colonies of Spain as an attack upon ourselves. But in the meantime the Russian minister, Baron Tuvill, on the 16th of October, communicated to the Secretary of State a declaration of the Emperor of Russia that the political principles of that Power would not permit him to recognize the independence of the revolted colonies of Spain.

Mr. Adams saw and seized his opportunity. He gave this advice to President Monroe, as appears by his diary, on November 7, 1823:

I remarked that the communications recently received from the Russian minister, Baron Tuvill, afforded, as I thought, a very suitable and convenient opportunity for us to take our stand against the Holy Alliance, and at the same time decline the overtures of Great Britain. It would be more candid and more dignified to avow our principles explicitly to Baron Tuvill than to go in as a cockboat in the wake of the British man-of-war. This idea was acquiesced in on all sides.

At the Cabinet meeting of November 15, 1823, the subject was again discussed.

Letters were read from Mr. Jefferson, who was for acceding to the pending proposal. Mr. Madison was less decisively pronounced, but thought the movement on the part of Great Britain impelled more by her interest than by a principle of general liberty. President Monroe was quite despondent.

Adams proceeds:

I soon found the source of the President's despondency with regard to South American affairs. Calhoun is perfectly moonstruck by the surrender of Cadiz, and says the Holy Allies, with 10,000 men, will restore all Mexico and all South America to the Spanish dominion. I did not deny that they might make a temporary impression for three, four, or five years, but I no more believe that the Holy Allies will restore the Spanish dominion upon the American continent than that Chimborazo will sink beneath the ocean. But, I added, if the South Americans were really in a state to be so easily subdued, it would be but a more forcible motive for us to beware of involving ourselves in their fate. I set this down as one of Calhoun's extravaganzas. He is for plunging into a war to prevent that which, if his opinion of it is correct, we are utterly unable to prevent. He is for embarking our lives and fortunes in a ship which he declares the very rats have abandoned. Calhoun reverts again to his idea of giving discretionary power to our minister to accede to all Canning's proposals, if necessary, but not otherwise. After much discussion, I said I thought we should bring the whole answer to Mr. Canning's proposals to a test of right and wrong. *Considering the South Americans as independent nations, they themselves, and no other nation, had the right to dispose of their condition. We have no right to dispose of them, either alone or in conjunction with other nations. Neither have any other nations the right of disposing of them without their consent. This principle will give us a clue to answer all Mr. Canning's questions with candor and confidence, and I am to draft a dispatch accordingly.* (Adams's Memoirs, p. 186.)

Before Mr. Adams prepared the draft, two more dispatches were received from Rush, dated the 2d and 10th of October, indicating a decided change in Canning's tone, and almost an indifference on his part to pursue his project of united action. Meantime, there came a new communication from Russia, which gave Adams his opportunity. He put his reply on the express and impregnable ground of the consent of the governed, as declared in our Declaration of Independence. On the 25th of November, he made, for the President's use, a draft of observations upon the communications recently received from the Russian minister. The paper begins as follows:

The Government of the United States of America is essentially republican. By their Constitution it is provided that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect them from invasion."

The principles of this polity are: 1. That the institution of government to be lawful, must be pacific, that is, founded upon the consent and by the agreement of those who are governed; and 2, that each nation is exclusively the judge of the government best suited to itself, and that no other nation can justly interfere by force to impose a different government upon it. The first of the principles may be designated as the principle of liberty, the second as the principle of national independence; they are both principles of peace and of good will to men.

A necessary consequence of the second of these principles is that the United States recognize in other nations the right which they claim and exercise for themselves of establishing and modifying their own governments, according to their own judgments and views of their interests, not encroaching upon the rights of others. (Ford, p. 38.)

Mr. Adams states later in the same document:

In the general declarations that the allied monarchs will never compound and never will even treat with the revolution, and that their policy has only for its object by forcible interposition to guarantee the tranquillity of all the States of which the civilized world is composed, the President wishes to perceive the sentiments, the application of which is limited, and intended in their results to be limited to the affairs of Europe. (Ford, p. 40.)

Mr. Monroe and Mr. Calhoun hesitated in regard to the insertion of this paragraph in the answer to Russia, but neither of them, as appears from the full narrative in Mr. Adams's diary, objected to the doctrine. They thought it might be offensive to Russia. Accordingly Mr. Adams read the paper to Baron Tuvill, omitting that paragraph, but received a letter from the President a little later, yielding his objections and consenting to its retention.

Mr. Worthington C. Ford, in an interesting paper contained in the Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society for January, 1902, narrates the whole story, and says in conclusion:

That the timidity of the President was awakened, that record shows; but the persistence of Adams and the very weighty arguments he advanced in its favor induced Monroe to yield, but not until it was too late for the purpose intended. (Ford, p. 40.)

liberty, being a weak people, and a people striving to deprive them of their independence and liberty, being a strong people, always, if the nature of man remains unchanged, the war is converted in the end into a conflict in which bushwhacking, treachery, and cruelty have to be encountered, the responsibility is with the men who made the war. Conflicts between white races and brown races or red races or black races, between superior races and inferior races, are always cruel on both sides, and the men who decree with full notice that such conflict shall take place are the men on whom the responsibility rests. When Aguinaldo said he did not desire the conflict to go on, and that it went on against his wish, he was told by our general that he would not parley with him without total submission. My friend from Wisconsin declared in the Senate that we would have no talk with men with arms in their hands, whether we were right or wrong. The responsibility of everything that has happened since, which he must have foreseen if he knew anything of history and human nature, rests upon him and the men who acted with him.

We can not get rid of this one fact, we can not escape it, and we can not flinch from it. You chose war instead of peace. You chose force instead of conciliation, with full notice that everything that has happened since would happen as a consequence of your decision. Had you made a declaration to Aguinaldo that you would respect their title to independence, and that all you desired was order and to fulfill the treaty and to protect your friends, you would have disarmed that people in a moment. I believe there never has been a time since when a like declaration made by this Chamber alone, but certainly made by this Chamber and the other House, with the approval of the President, would not have ended this conflict and prevented all these horrors.

Instead of that gentlemen talked of the wealth of the Philippine Islands, and about the advantage to our trade. They sought to dazzle our eyes with nuggets of other men's gold. Senators declared in the Senate Chamber and on the hustings that the flag never shall be hauled down in the Philippine Islands, and those of you who think otherwise keep silent and enter no disclaimer. The Senator from Ohio says our policy has not been in the dark, but it has been a policy published to the world. Has it? Has it? I want to ask, What was it which created the war, which keeps it up, and which created and keeps up the hatred, and will make war break out again and again for centuries to come, unless human nature be changed or be different in their bosoms from what it is in ours? It is because our policy has not been published to the world. It is because you keep a padlock on your lips.

This debate for the last three years has contained many audacities. One thing, however, no Senator has been audacious enough to affirm, and that is that if he were a Filipino, as he is an American, he would not do exactly, saving only acts of cruelty, as the Filipino has done.

I find myself beset with one difficulty whenever I undertake to debate this question. I am to discuss and denounce what seems to me one of the most foolish and wicked chapters in history. Yet I am compelled to admit that the men who are responsible for it are neither foolish nor wicked. On the contrary, there are no men on the face of the earth with whom on nearly all other subjects I am in general more in accord, to whose sound judgment or practical sagacity I am more willing to defer, or to whose patriotism or humanity I am more willing to commit the honor or the fate of the Republic.

It may be that it is presumption to act on my own judgment against that of my valued and beloved political friends. But we do not settle questions of righteousness or justice on any man's authority. Still less do we settle them by a show of hands. Each man is responsible only to his own conscience, which is the only authority he must obey. Besides, Mr. President, I have on my side in this great debate the fathers of the Republic, the statesmen who adorned its first century, the founders of the Republican party, every one of whom declared and lived by and died by the doctrine you are now repudiating. I have also your own authority, your own declaration, made only three years ago, at the beginning of the Spanish war. When you declared that Cuba of right—of right—ought to be a free and independent State, and that the United States would not acquire her territory as the result of the war with Spain, you settled as a matter of duty and of justice this whole Philippine question.

I have, however, at least, to congratulate my friends who differ from me on an increased sobriety in dealing with this matter.

We are not flourishing nuggets of gold in the Senate just now. The devil imperialism is not promising us all the kingdoms of this world and the glory thereof, if we will fall down and worship him. You have just hauled down the American flag in China where it once floated, and you have just hauled it down day before yesterday in Cuba where it has floated for three years.

For the words, "interests of the United States," which the

McEnery resolution declared were to determine our actions in governing these islands, you substitute in this bill the declaration that "the rights acquired in the Philippine Islands under the treaty with Spain are to be administered for the benefit of the inhabitants of those islands."

SEC. 10. That all the property and rights which may have been acquired in the Philippine Islands by the United States under the treaty of peace with Spain, 1898, are hereby placed under the control of the government of the Philippine Islands, to be administered for the benefit of inhabitants of the islands.

SEC. 7. There are to be municipal and provincial governments as far and as fast as the governments are capable, fit, and ready for the same, with popular representative government.

The share to which you propose to admit these people in your scheme of government, is an admission that a large number of them are fit for self-government. You propose for them—to take effect in the near future—a constitution, not very different from that of Canada, where the Crown of England appoints the Governor-General, and the Governor-General appoints the senate, and there is a veto on every provincial law by the Governor-General, and a veto on every law of the Canadian congress, not only by the Governor-General, but by the Government at home.

The Senator from New Hampshire called a witness the other day to the effect that every Filipino would take a bribe. Sir Robert Walpole said that of England. I acquit the majority of the Senate and the committee who report this bill from believing the charge made by my honorable friend from New Hampshire. They affirm that there are many Filipinos who are sincerely our friends. They admit, if I understand them, that there are in those islands many citizens accomplished and well educated, lawyers and merchants, conducting large affairs in trade, and they themselves propose to commit to these people at once, as soon as may be, large powers of government, retaining for us little more than the power of a veto.

What you have been fighting for all this time as your right, if you expect to enact this bill into law and to carry it out in practice, is to substitute a constitution of your making for one of their making; to have a dependency, which is what you want, instead of a republic, which is what they want; to have fitness for the elective franchise determined by an authority which has its source 10,000 miles away, instead of with the people at home; and to deny them independence, even if they are fit for it, so long as you please, without any regard to their desire.

This investigation, I suppose, is yet upon the threshold. Your chief witnesses, so far, have been soldiers and governors who are committed to policies of subjugation. The investigation has been conducted by a committee of that way of thinking.

Yet we have got already some pregnant admissions, and some remarkable facts have already come to light. Governor Taft, if I understood him, concedes that nothing so far indicates that the existing policy has been good for the United States. It is only the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands, in saving them from anarchy, or from foreign nations, in establishing schools for them, that vindicates what you have done so far. What you have done so far has been to get some few thousand children actually at school in the whole Philippine dominion. To get this result, you have certainly slain many times that number of parents.

It would be without avail to repeat in the Senate to-day what was said at the time of the Spanish treaty, and afterwards when you determined to reduce the Philippine people by force to submission.

What your fathers said when they founded the Republic; the declarations of the great leaders of every generation; our century of glorious history, were appealed to in vain. Their lessons fell upon the ears of men dazzled by military glory and delirious with the lust of conquest. I will not repeat them now. My desire to-day is simply to call attention to the practical working of the two doctrines—the doctrine of buying sovereignty or conquering it in battle, and the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence. For the last three years you have put one of them in force in Cuba and the other in the Philippine Islands. I ask you to think soberly which method, on the whole, you like better. I ask you to compare the cost of war with the cost of peace, of justice with that of injustice, the cost of empire with the cost of republican liberty, the cost of the way of America and the way of Europe, of the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence with the doctrine of the Holy Alliance. You have tried both, I hope, to your heart's content. But before I do that I want to call attention to one important fact in our history not generally known. It is very interesting in its connection with this debate.

John Quincy Adams, as everybody knows, was the father of what we call the Monroe doctrine. He secured its adoption through the weight of his great influence, by a hesitating President, and a reluctant Cabinet. It is not so well known that he placed the Monroe doctrine solely upon the doctrine that just

praying for the publication of a new edition of charters, constitutions, and organic laws of the United States, with accompanying letters, be reprinted with corrections.

The motion was agreed to.

PAY OF THE NAVY.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed, at as early date as is practicable, to furnish to the Senate detailed items of all expenditures under the head of "Pay of the Navy," in the naval appropriation bill for the year ending June 30, 1902, said detailed statement to cover the separate expenditures under each item in said appropriation bill under the head of "Pay of the Navy."

CHANNELS AT NAVY-YARDS ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby directed to furnish full information to the Senate respecting the depth of water at different places at low tide in the channel leading from the sea to the Mare Island Navy-Yard, and to state whether or not any first-class battle ship has ever been taken to said navy-yard, and also to furnish full information as to the depth of water near and about the navy-yard in Puget Sound.

EXPENDITURES OF NAVY DEPARTMENT IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President, the resolutions which have just been adopted remind me that on the 17th day of April the Senate passed a resolution directing the Secretary of the Navy to report the expenditures of the Navy Department in the Philippines. That has been more than a month ago, and I should like to inquire if the resolution has yet been answered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the clerks that they have no memorandum of an answer to the resolution.

RENTAL OF BUILDINGS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney-General, the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Service Commission, and the Department of Labor are hereby directed to transmit to the Senate, at the earliest practicable day, detailed information concerning quarters rented by each of said departments and commissions, giving the location, area of floor space occupied, and the annual rental in each case.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. If the morning business is concluded, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2295.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I have something to say upon the pending bill. I will say it as briefly and as compactly as I may. We have to deal with a territory 10,000 miles away, 1,200 miles in extent, containing 10,000,000 people. A majority of the Senate think that people are under the American flag and lawfully subject to our authority. We are not at war with them or with anybody. The country is in a condition of profound peace as well as of unexampled prosperity. The world is in profound peace, except in one quarter, in South Africa, where a handful of republicans are fighting for their independence, and have been doing better fighting than has been done on the face of the earth since Thermopylae, or certainly since Bannockburn.

Yet the Filipinos have a right to call it war. They claim to be a people and to be fighting for their rights as a people. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] admits that there is a people there, although he says they are not one people, but there are several. But we can not be at war under the Constitution without an act of Congress.

We are not at war. We made peace with Spain on the 14th day of February, 1899. Congress has never declared war with the people of the Philippine Islands. The President has never asserted nor usurped the power to do it. We are only doing on a large scale exactly what we have done at home within a few years past, where the military forces of the United States have been called out to suppress a riot or a tumult or a lawless assembly, too strong for the local authorities. You have the same right to administer the water torture, or to hang men by the thumbs, to extort confession, in one case as in the other. You have the same right to do it in Cleveland or Pittsburg or at Colorado Springs as you have to do it within the Philippine Islands. I have the same right as an American citizen or an American Senator to discuss the conduct of any military officer in the Philippine Islands that I have to discuss the conduct of a marshal or a constable or a captain in Pittsburg or in Cleveland if there were a labor riot there.

That duty I mean to perform to the best of my ability, fear-

lessly as becomes an American citizen, and honestly as becomes an American Senator.

But I have an anterior duty and an anterior right to talk about the action of the American Senate, both in the past and in the present, for which, as no man will deny, I have my full share of personal responsibility.

The Senator from Ohio, in his very brilliant and forcible speech, which I heard with delight and instruction, said that we were bound to restore order in the Philippine Islands, and we can not leave them till that should be done. He said we were bound to keep the faith we pledged to Spain in the treaty, and that we were bound, before we left, to see that secured. He said we were bound, especially, to look out for the safety of the Filipinos who had been our friends, and that we could not, in honor, depart until that should be made secure.

All that, Mr. President, is true. So far as I know, no man has doubted it. But these things are not what we are fighting for; not one of them. There never was a time when, if we had declared that we only were there to keep faith with Spain, and that we only were there to restore order, that we were only there to see that no friend of ours should suffer at the hands of any enemy of ours, that the war would not have ended in that moment.

You are fighting for sovereignty. You are fighting for the principle of eternal dominion over that people, and that is the only question in issue in the conflict. We said in the case of Cuba that she had a right to be free and independent. We affirmed in the Teller resolution, I think without a negative voice, that we would not invade that right and would not meddle with her territory or anything that belonged to her. That declaration was a declaration of peace as well as of righteousness; and we made the treaty, so far as concerned Cuba, and conducted the war and have conducted ourselves ever since on that theory—that we had no right to interfere with her independence; that we had no right to her territory or to anything that was Cuba's. So we only demanded in the treaty that Spain should hereafter let her alone. If you had done to Cuba as you have done to the Philippine Islands, who had exactly the same right, you would be at this moment, in Cuba, just where Spain was when she excited the indignation of the civilized world and we compelled her to let go. And if you had done in the Philippines as you did in Cuba, you would be to-day or would soon be in those islands as you are in Cuba.

But you made a totally different declaration about the Philippine Islands. You undertook in the treaty to acquire sovereignty over her for yourself, which that people denied. You declared not only in the treaty, but in many public utterances in this Chamber and elsewhere, that you had a right to buy sovereignty with money, or to treat it as the spoils of war or the booty of battle. The moment you made that declaration the Filipino people gave you notice that they treated it as a declaration of war. So your generals reported, and so Aguinaldo expressly declared. The President sent out an order to take forcible possession, by military power, of those islands. General Otis tried to suppress it, but it leaked out at Iloilo through General Miller. General Otis tried to suppress it and substitute that they should have all the rights of the most favored provinces. He stated that he did that because he knew the proclamation would bring on war. And the next day Aguinaldo covered the walls of Manila with a proclamation stating what President McKinley had done, and saying that if that were persisted in he and his people would fight, and General MacArthur testified that Aguinaldo represented the entire people. So you deliberately made up the issue for a fight for dominion on one side and a fight for liberty on the other.

Then when you had ratified the treaty you voted down the resolution in the Senate, known as the Bacon resolution, declaring the right of that people to independence, and you passed the McEnery resolution, which declared that you meant to dispose of those islands as should be for the interest of the United States. That was the origin of the war, if it be war. That is what the war is all about, if it be war; and it is idle for my brilliant and ingenious friend from Ohio to undertake to divert this issue to a contest on our part to enable us to keep faith with our friends among the Filipinos, or to restore order there, or to carry out the provisions of the treaty with Spain.

Now, Mr. President, when you determined to resort to force for that purpose, you took upon yourself every natural consequence of that condition. The natural result of a conflict of arms between a people coming out of subjection and a highly civilized people—one weak and the other strong, with all the powers and resources of civilization—is inevitably, as everybody knows, that there will be cruelty on one side and retaliation by cruelty on the other. You knew it even before it happened, as well as you know it now that it has happened; and the responsibility is yours.

If, in a conflict between a people fighting for independence and

In line 6, before the word "thousand," strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one;" and

Amend the title so as to read: "A joint resolution to provide for the printing of 5,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1901, inclusive."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York moves that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House. The motion was agreed to.

BINDING AND DISTRIBUTION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a joint resolution providing for the binding and distribution of public documents held in the custody of the superintendent of documents, unbound, upon orders of Senators, etc., and I ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 103) providing for the binding and distribution of public documents held in the custody of the superintendent of documents, unbound, upon orders of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and officers of Congress, when such documents are not called for within two years after printing, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled. That hereafter the documents reserved for binding upon orders of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and officers of Congress, as provided in paragraph 6, section 54, of an act approved January 12, 1896, providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents, if not called for and delivered within two years after printing, shall be bound in first grades of cloth and delivered to the superintendent of documents for distribution to libraries; and the Public Printer is hereby authorized and directed to bind in cloth all such documents heretofore delivered to the superintendent of documents for like distribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOAR. I do not exactly understand the joint resolution. I understand that the documents which are to be delivered to Senators are bound in a particular way—in calf.

Mr. PLATT of New York. No; they are not bound at all. I will ask the Secretary to read a letter from the Public Printer on the subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letter of the Public Printer will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE,
OFFICE OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1902.

Hon. T. C. PLATT,
Chairman Committee on Printing, United States Senate.

SIR: In accordance with provisions of paragraph 6 of section 54 of the act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents, approved January 12, 1896, there have been delivered to the superintendent of documents about 175,000 volumes of the reserved documents. These documents are in loose sheets, tied in bundles. The superintendent of documents states that, in their present condition, they can not be distributed or sold. There are, therefore, only two methods of disposing of them; they must either be bound so they can be distributed to libraries, or condemned and sold as waste paper, as they should not be stored at great expense to the Government, as is now the case. It would appear to be almost a crime to dispose of them as waste paper when so many libraries desire them.

I have the honor to inclose herewith a draft of a bill providing for the binding and distribution of the documents which have been turned over to the superintendent of documents, as well as the binding of all such documents in the future, and have to request that, if it meets with your approval, you introduce it in the Senate and request its early consideration.

The estimated cost of binding the documents now on storage is \$35,000.

Respectfully,

F. W. PALMER, Public Printer.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHAMBLIN, DELANEY & SCOTT.

Mr. MARTIN. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 989) to authorize the Light-House Board to pay to Chamblin, Delaney & Scott the sum of \$1,704.46, to report it without amendment, and I ask for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to Messrs. Chamblin, Delaney & Scott, of Richmond, Va., \$1,704.46 out of the appropriation for Marblehead light-house made by the Fifty-third Congress.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. PROCTOR, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved. That the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate is hereby authorized to appoint an assistant clerk at the compensation of \$1,440 per annum, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, until otherwise provided by law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Mr. BACON introduced a bill (S. 5929) granting a pension to Margaret J. McCranie; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LODGE introduced a bill (S. 5930) for removing the wreck of the battle ship Maine, and recovering the bodies therefrom; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5931) granting an increase of pension to Clara E. Daniels; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 5932) granting an increase of pension to William Kirkpatrick; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP introduced a bill (S. 5933) granting an honorable discharge to Jacob Neibles; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. KEARNS introduced a bill (S. 5934) granting a pension to Alfred Kent; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5935) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. O'Reilly;

A bill (S. 5936) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Crawford; and

A bill (S. 5937) granting an increase of pension to William O. Eagle;

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 5938) granting an increase of pension to Henry O. McClure; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 5939) providing for the election of a Delegate from the Territory of Alaska to the House of Representatives of the United States, and defining the qualifications of electors in said Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. DEBOE introduced a bill (S. 5940) for the relief of Henry P. Montgomery; which was read twice by its title, and, with an accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SIMMONS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 5941) for the relief of K. H. Lewis and W. F. Lewis; and

A bill (S. 5942) for the relief of the heirs of C. H. Foy.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 5943) to correct the naval record of George Nelson Armstrong; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5944) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Willey, alias William F. Willey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 104) authorizing the Tacoma Spring Water Company to lay pipes in certain streets; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. CLARK of Montana submitted the following amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

An amendment proposing to increase the salary of the justices of the peace in the District of Columbia from \$2,000 to \$3,000;

An amendment proposing an appropriation to pay a justice of the peace designated to serve as judge of the police court \$5 a day while so serving;

An amendment to strike out, on page 44, lines 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, relative to the fees of notaries public; and

An amendment proposing to appropriate \$275 each to justices of the peace acting as ad interim judges in the police court.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to contract with the Holland Torpedo Boat Company for 30 of its most improved type of submarine torpedo boats, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CHARTERS AND CONSTITUTIONS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that Senate Document No. 76, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, being in the nature of a petition,

of land that was swamp and overflowed land, and which had been granted to said State by the aforesaid act of Congress; and

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill entitled "A bill to finally adjust the swamp-land grant, and for other purposes," said bill being H. R. 8325; and

Whereas said bill provides for the adjustment of the swamp-land grant, directing the Secretary of the Interior of the United States Government to refund the money received by the Government of the United States for the sale of swamp and overflowed lands to the State of Iowa and other States; and

Whereas the several counties of the State of Iowa have claims filed with the Secretary of the Interior against the Government of the United States for the purchase price of various tracts of swamp-lands sold and patented by the Government of the United States, which claims could be fully adjusted under said bill now pending before the Congress of the United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the legislature of the State of Iowa, That the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Iowa are respectfully and earnestly requested and urged to use all honorable means to secure the passage and enactment in a law of the bill now pending before the House of Representatives of the United States, being designated H. R. 8325. Be it further

Resolved, That the governor of the State of Iowa is hereby requested to cause a copy of this concurrent resolution to be furnished to the United States Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of Robert Jackson Post, No. 192, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, of Corydon, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to modify and simplify the pension laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Iowa State Retail Grocers' Association, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the repeal of the national bankruptcy law, or to so amend it as to better protect the retail merchant against his debtors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Iowa State Retail Grocers' Association, of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the use of trading stamps, checks, and other gift enterprises; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of Federal Labor Union, No. 4146, American Federation of Labor, of Boone, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented resolutions of the Turnvereins of Holstein, Waterloo, Elkader, Ottumwa, and Guttenberg, all in the State of Iowa, expressing sympathy with the people of the South African Republic and the Orange Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of Lodge No. 104, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Moulton; of Lodge No. 520, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Council Bluffs; of Local Division No. 117, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Mason City; of Local Division No. 203, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Perry; of Lodge No. 86, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Perry; of Local Division No. 211, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Junction City; of Lodge No. 138, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Boynton; of Lodge No. 183, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Clinton, and of Lodge No. 311, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Belle Plains, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BLACKBURN presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kentucky, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the internal-revenue laws relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of the Social Reform Club of New York City; of the Citizens' Union of the Twentieth assembly district of Kings County, Brooklyn; of the Republican Club of the Twenty-sixth assembly district, of New York City, and of the Chamber of Commerce of Troy, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of letter carriers; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented a petition of the Prohibition State Central Committee of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the so-called anti-canteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Fort Wayne Encampment, Union Veteran Legion, of Fort Wayne, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation granting per-diem service pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Jonesboro, Ind., of the congregation of the Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, of West Brighton, N. Y., and of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Delaware, Ohio, praying for the enactment of leg-

islation to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in immigrant stations; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of Ashton Division, No. 186, Order of Railway Conductors, of Huntington, W. Va., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEARNS presented a petition of Hall of Division No. 124, Order of Railway Conductors, of Ogden, Utah, praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy," and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DEPEW presented a petition of the National Afro-American Council, praying for the creating of a commission to inquire into the condition of the colored people of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Citizens' Union of the Twentieth assembly district of Kings County, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. HALE (for Mr. FRYE) presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Thomaston, Me., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 679) directing the issue of a check in lieu of a lost check drawn by Capt. E. O. Fechté, disbursing officer, United States Signal Service Corps, in favor of the Bishop Gutta Percha Company, reported it with amendments.

Mr. SIMON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4068) to redivide the district of Alaska into three recording and judicial divisions, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McLAURIN of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2764) for the relief of the Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 473) granting an increase of pension to Mabry H. Presley, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3910) granting a pension to Dennis J. Kelly;

A bill (H. R. 3733) granting an increase of pension to Israel Haller;

A bill (H. R. 13217) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Dodge; and

A bill (H. R. 10773) granting a pension to Archer Bartlett.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13398) granting an increase of pension to George G. Sabin, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5928) to establish an assay office at Tacoma, Wash., reported it with amendments.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4636) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to adjust the accounts of Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company for transporting the United States mails, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5229) to authorize, settle, and compromise certain litigation pending in the circuit court for the western district of North Carolina, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

REPORTS OF GETTYSBURG NATIONAL PARK COMMISSION.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom were referred the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. R. 46) to provide for the printing of 6,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1901, inclusive, to report them back and move concurrence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut). The amendments will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 3, before the word "thousand," strike out the word "six" and in lieu thereof insert the word "five;"

Also, a bill (H. R. 14631) granting an increase of pension to George Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14632) for the relief of David S. Dorland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 14633) for the relief of heirs of Antoine Decuer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 14634) granting an increase of pension to Francis Kittel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NAPHEN: A bill (H. R. 14635) for the relief of the city of Boston—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 14636) granting an increase of pension to Frederick S. Pritchard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14637) to increase the pension of Henry Jeffers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 14638) for the relief of Henry Priest, of Fauquier County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 14639) granting an increase of pension to Herbert A. Whitworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 14640) for the relief of Joseph B. Banks—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 14641) granting a pension to I. Winslow Ayer—to the Committee on Invalid Pension.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 14642) granting a pension to Mary A. Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Papers to accompany House bill 14624, for the relief of Louis R. Newland—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELL: Resolutions of Victor Post, No. 100, of Victor, Colo., Department of Colorado and Wyoming, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring House bill 3067, relating to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers' Union No. 1772, of Palisade, Colo., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of the Pueblo Trades and Labor Assembly, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CAPRON: Resolution of the town council of North Kingston, R. I., urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CREAMER: Resolutions of the Social Reform Club of the City of New York, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DRAPER: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Troy, N. Y., in favor of the proposed increase of pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FEELY: Petition of M. Gindorff and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., for repeal of the duties on beef, veal, mutton, and pork—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the city council of Evanston, Ill., in favor of legislation to pension the members of the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Reading, Pa., urging the passage of a service pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HITT: Resolutions of Carpenters and Joiners' Union of Rockford, Ill., urging the passage of the Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill increasing the appropriation to the United States Geological Survey—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of William H. Sabin Post, No. 780, of Stonington, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Illinois, for the passage of a bill to modify and simplify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KERN: Resolutions of Mine Workers' Union, No. 7434, of Lebanon, Ill., favoring an educational test for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of Cigar Makers' Union No. 250, of Belleville, Ill., protesting against reduction of duty on imported cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of citizens of Carolington, Ind. T., urging the passage of the Moon Territorial bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MANN: Resolutions of the common council of Evanston, Ill., urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolutions of the common council of Boston, Mass., favoring the passage of House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Henry Priest—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolutions of the National Business League of Chicago, Ill., in favor of the establishment of a department of commerce and industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the New York Turnverein, advocating the adoption of a resolution of sympathy for the Boers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Social Reform Club of New York City, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RYAN: Resolutions of city council of Evanston, Ill., in favor of a law to pension men of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of National Business League of Chicago, Ill., favoring the establishment of a department of commerce and industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of citizens of Wagoner, Ind. T., praying for the passage of a bill authorizing the appointment of three additional United States commissioners and constables for the western district and two additional United States commissioners and constables for the northern district of the Indian Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the Church Association for the Advancement of the Interests of Labor, New York, for the suppression of the beef trust—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Papers to accompany war claim of Joseph B. Banks—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEEKS: Resolutions of the Michigan Sugar Manufacturing Association, relative to reciprocity with Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of a meeting of citizens of Detroit, Mich., advocating the adoption of a resolution of sympathy for the Boers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Port Huron, Mich., relative to condemnation and purchase of certain lands in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 22, 1902.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SCOTT, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry ex-Union soldiers, inmates of the Soldiers' Home of California, praying for the enactment of legislation granting per diem service pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of Duluth Division, No. 336, Order of Railway Conductors, of Duluth, Minn., praying for the passage of the so-called Hoar anti-injunction bill, to limit the meaning of the word "conspiracy" and the use of "restraining orders and injunctions" in certain cases, and remonstrating against the passage of any substitute therefor; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of Iowa, relative to the enactment of legislation to finally adjust the swamp-land grants. I ask that the concurrent resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The concurrent resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Public Lands, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of Iowa (the senate concurring), That,

Whereas the act of Congress of September 23, 1850, granted to the State of Iowa and other States all swamp lands situated within the several States; and

Whereas the second section of said act directed the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw from sale the swamp lands within said States and to furnish the governors of said States a list of said swamp lands; and

Whereas the Secretary of the Interior failed to comply with the requirements of said law and proceeded thereafter to sell a great amount of land that was swamp and overflowed land, and under such sales the United States caused patent to issue for said lands; and

Whereas the State of Iowa was thereby deprived of title to a great amount

your intellectual vision was dazzled with empire, you did not know that this was to come. But you might have known it. A little reflection and a little reason would have told you. I wonder if the Republican editor who made that known was attacking the American Army. I wonder if those of us who do not like that are the friends or the enemies of the American soldier.

I can not understand how any man, certainly how any intelligent student of history, could have failed to foretell exactly what has happened when we agreed to the Spanish treaty. Everything that has happened since has been the natural, inevitable, inexorable result of the policy you then declared.

If you knew anything of human nature you knew that the great doctrine that just government depends on the consent of the governed, as applied to the relation of one people to another, has its foundation in the nature of man itself. No people will submit, if it can be helped, to the rule of any other people. You must have known perfectly well, if you had stopped to consider, that so far as the Philippine people were like us they would do exactly what we did and would do again in a like case. So far as they were civilized they would resist you with all the power of civilized war. So far as they were savage they would resist you by all the methods of savage warfare.

You never could eradicate from the hearts of that people by force the love of liberty which God put there.

For He that worketh high and wise,
Nor pauseth in His plan,
Will take the sun out of the skies
Ere freedom out of man.

This war, if you call it war, has gone on for three years. It will go on in some form for three hundred years, unless this policy be abandoned. You will undoubtedly have times of peace and quiet, or pretended submission. You will buy men with titles, or office, or salaries. You will intimidate cowards. You will get pretended and fawning submission. The land will smile and seem at peace. But the volcano will be there. The lava will break out again. You can never settle this thing until you settle it right.

I think my friends of the majority, whatever else they may claim—and they can rightly claim a great deal that is good and creditable for themselves—will not claim to be prophets. They used to prophesy a good deal two years ago. We had great prophets and minor prophets. All predicted peace and submission, and a flag followed by trade, with wealth flowing over this land from the Far East, and the American people standing in the Philippine Islands looking over with eager gaze toward China. Where are now your prophets which prophesied unto you? I fear that we must make the answer that was made to the children of Israel: "They prophesied falsely, and the prophets have become wind, and the word is not in them."

An instance of this delusion, which seems to have prevailed everywhere, is stated by Mr. Andrew Carnegie in the May number of the North American Review. He says:

The writer had the honor of an interview with President McKinley before war broke out with our allies, and ventured to predict that if he attempted to exercise sovereignty over the Filipinos—whom he had bought at \$2.50 a head—he would be shooting these people down within thirty days. He smiled, and, addressing a gentleman who was present, said: "Mr. Carnegie doesn't understand the situation at all." Then turning to the writer, he said: "We will be welcomed as their best friends." "So little," says Mr. Carnegie, "did dear, kind, loving President McKinley expect ever to be other than the friendly cooperator with these people."

A guerrilla warfare, carried on by a weaker people against a stronger, is recognized and legitimate. Many nations have resorted to it. Our war of the Revolution in many parts of the country differed little from it. Spain carried it on against Napoleon when the French forces overran her territory, and mankind sympathized with her. The greatest of English poets since Milton, William Wordsworth, described that warfare in a noble sonnet, which will answer, with scarcely the change of a word, as a description of the Filipino people:

Hunger, and sultry heat, and nipping blast
From bleak hilltop, and length of march by night
Through heavy swamp or over snow-clad height—
These hardships ill-sustained, these dangers past,
The roving Spanish bands are reached at last,
Charged, and dispersed like foam; but as a flight
Of scattered quails by signs do reunite,
So these—and, heard of once again, are chased
With combination of long-practiced art
And newly kindled hope; but they are fled,
Gone are they, viewless as the buried dead:
Where now? Their sword is at the foe's heart!
And thus from year to year his walk they thwart,
And hang like dreams around his guilty bed.

I believe the American Army, officers and soldiers, to be made up of as brave and humane men, in general, as ever lived. They have done what has always been done, and until human nature shall change, always will be done in all like conditions. The chief guilt is on the heads of those who created the conditions.

One thing, however, I am bound to say in all frankness. I do not know but my statement may be challenged. But I am sure

that nearly every well-informed man who will hear it or read it will know that it is true. That is, that you will never get officers or soldiers in the standing Army, as a rule, to give testimony which they think will be disagreeable to their superiors or to the War Department.

I have letters in large numbers myself. I believe every Senator in this body, who is expected to do anything to inquire into these atrocities, has had abundant letters to the effect which I state. The same evil of which we are all conscious, which leads men in public life to be unwilling to incur unpopularity or the displeasure of their constituents by frankly uttering and acting upon their opinions, applies with a hundredfold more force when you summon a soldier or an officer to tell facts which will bear heavily on the administration of the war. I have had letters shown me by members of this body who vouched personally for the absolute trustworthiness of the writers, who detailed the horrors of the water torture and other kindred atrocities, which no inducement would lead them to make public.

The private soldier who has ended his term of service or who expects to end it and return to private life, is under less restraint. But when he tells his story he is met by the statement of an officer, in some cases, that it is well known that private soldiers are in the habit of "drawing the long bow," to use the phrase of one general whose name has been brought into this discussion. In other words, these generals are so jealous of the honor of the Army, and their own, that they confine their jealousy to the honor of the officers, and expect you to reject these things on the assertion that the soldier is an habitual liar, and then they reproach the men who complain with being indifferent to the honor of the Army.

Was it ever heard before that a civilized, humane, and Christian nation made war upon a people and refused to tell them what they wanted of them? You refuse to tell these people this year or next year or perhaps for twenty years, whether you mean in the end to deprive them of their independence, or no. You say you want them to submit. To submit to what? To mere military force? But for what purpose or what end is that military force to be exerted? You decline to tell them. Not only you decline to say what you want of them, except bare and abject surrender, but you will not even let them tell you what they ask of you.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] says it is asserted with a show of reason that a majority of the people favor our cause. General MacArthur denies this statement, and says they were almost a unit for Aguinaldo. Mr. Denby and Mr. Schurman, two of the three commissioners of the first Filipino Commission, deny the statement. General Bell, in his letter of December 13, 1901, says "a majority of the inhabitants of his province have persistently continued their opposition during the entire period of three years, and that the men who accept local office from the governor and take the oath of allegiance do it solely for the purpose of improving their opportunity for resistance." That statement is concurred in by every department commander there. Certainly Major Gardener's apparently temperate and fair statement—about which we are to have no opportunity to examine him until Congress adjourns—does not say any such thing as that suggested by the Senator from Ohio.

But what is your cause? What is your cause that they favor? Do you mean that a majority of the Filipino people favor your killing them? Certainly not. Do you mean that a majority of the Filipino people, or that any one man in the Philippine Islands, according to the evidence of Governor Taft himself, favors anything that you are willing to do?

The evidence is that some of them favor their admission as an American State and others favor a government of their own under your protection. Others would like to come in as a Territory under our Constitution. But is there any evidence that one human being there is ready to submit to your government without any rights under our Constitution, or without any prospect of coming in as an American State? Or is there any evidence that any single American citizen, in the Senate or out of it, is willing that we should do anything that a single Filipino is ready to consent to?

I have no doubt they will take the oath of allegiance. Undoubtedly they will go through the form of submission. Undoubtedly you have force enough to make the whole region a howling wilderness, if you think fit. Undoubtedly you can put up a form of government in which they will seem to take some share, and they will take your offices and your salaries. But when you come to getting anything which is not merely temporary; when you come to announce anything in principle, such as those on which governments are founded, you have not any evidence of any considerable number of people there ready to submit to your will unless they are compelled by sheer brutal force.

I do not wish to dwell at length on the circumstances which attended the capture of Aguinaldo. But as they have been elaborately defended in this body, and it is said that the officer who

captured him had a good record before, and especially as he has been decorated by a promotion by the advice and consent of the Senate, I can not let it pass in silence.

I understand the facts to be that that officer disguised the men under his command in the dress of Filipino soldiers; wrote, or caused to be written, a forged letter to Aguinaldo, purporting to come from one of his officers, stating that he was about to bring him some prisoners he had captured, and in that way got access to Aguinaldo's headquarters. As he approached he sent a message to Aguinaldo that he and his friends were hungry; accepted food at his hands, and when in his presence threw down and seized him; shot some of the soldiers who were about Aguinaldo, and brought him back a prisoner into our lines. That is the transaction which is so highly applauded in imperialistic quarters.

I do not believe that the Senate knew what it was doing when it consented to General Funston's promotion. The nomination came in with a list of Army and Navy appointments and promotions—2,038 in all—and the Senate assented to that at the same time with 1,828 others. I doubt very much whether there were 10 Senators in their seats or whether one of them listened to the list as it was read. It is, I suppose, betraying no secret to say that these lists are almost never read to the Senate when they come in or when they are reported from the committee; that the only reading they get is at the time of the confirmation, when they commonly attract no attention whatever. I do not mean to say that if the Senate had had its attention called to the transaction the result would have been different. I only mean to say that I believe many Senators did not know it. I suppose the question whether the Senate would have approved it might have depended on the character and the quality of the general service of that officer and not on the estimate we formed of this particular transaction, which seems to have been done under orders. I did not know myself that the nomination had been made till long after the Senate had assented. But I incline to think, with General MacArthur's testimony before the investigating committee that the act was done by his direction and with his approval, I should not have thought it fair to hold the officer responsible for it by denying him an otherwise deserved promotion.

I think we are bound in justice to General Funston to take the declaration of General MacArthur that he ordered and approved everything that officer did. If that be true we have no right to hold the subordinate responsible, however odious the act. If it turn out that that still higher authority has approved the act, then it becomes still more emphatically our duty to point out its enormity.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], whom I do not now see in his seat, asked me day before yesterday whether I did not believe that the reports of the military officers were to be trusted. If he were in his seat, I would ask him to put me that question again, and if he should I would put this question to him: When Theodore Roosevelt, an officer of volunteers, told his story about the canned beef and the military supplies, and every officer in the Regular Army, who knew the facts just as he did, contradicted him in the investigation, does he believe that Theodore Roosevelt or the officers of the Regular Army told the truth?

Mr. President, I want to say something on the circumstances which attended the capture of Aguinaldo. They have been elaborately defended in this body, and the officer who did it has been decorated with a promotion. I do not suppose 10 Senators knew what they were doing. The name came in with several thousand names of sailors and soldiers in one day, and nearly 2,000 were confirmed the next day. As everybody knows, they are never read except at the time of the confirmation. But although I did not know anything about it myself, I am bound to say, in all fairness, that since General MacArthur, the superior officer, has testified that he approved the act and takes the responsibility for the act, the subordinate is acquitted so far as that act is concerned; and I do not see how we could have refused General Funston his promotion if his record in other respects entitled him to it, if he acted as General MacArthur says he did, under orders. But the higher the responsibility for the act the more it is our duty to examine it.

Mr. President, we have two guides for the conduct of military officers in such circumstances. They apply not only to this act of General Funston, but they apply to most of the conduct of our military officers, of which complaint has been made. One of these is Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field, prepared by Dr. Francis Lieber and promulgated by order of Abraham Lincoln.

The other is the convention at The Hague, agreed upon by the representatives of this Government with the others on the 29th day of July, 1899, and ratified by the Senate on the 14th of March, 1902.

Observe that this convention was agreed upon before all these acts happened, and was unanimously adopted after they had all happened.

I extract from the Instructions for the Government Regulation of Armies in the Field the following paragraphs:

Paragraph 148 is this:

The law of war does not allow proclaiming either an individual belonging to the hostile army or a citizen or a subject of the hostile government an outlaw, who may be slain without trial by any captor, any more than the modern law of peace allows such intentional outlawry. On the contrary, it abhors such outrage. The sternest retaliation should follow the murder committed in consequence of such proclamation, made by whatever authority. Civilized nations look with horror upon offers of rewards for the assassination of enemies as relapses into barbarism.

Now, Mr. President, is it denied that hundreds upon hundreds of Filipinos have been put to death without trial? Has any soldier or officer been brought to trial by our authority for these offenses? Now, if it be an outrage upon which "nations look with horror," to use the language of that paragraph, and which "the law of war * * * abhors," is it any less a crime to be abhorred when it is done without such proclamation? The proclamation does not, according to this authority, justify the officer or soldier who acts in obedience to it. On the contrary, his conduct is abhorrent to all civilized mankind. And yet these things pass without condemnation, without punishment, without trial. Gentlemen seem to be impatient when they are asked to investigate them, or even to hear the story told in the Senate of the United States.

Paragraph 16 is:

Military necessity does not admit of cruelty—that is, the infliction of suffering for the sake of suffering or for revenge, nor of maiming or wounding except in fight, nor of torture to extort confession. It does not admit of the use of poison in any way nor of the wanton devastation of a district. It admits of deception, but disclaims acts of perfidy, and, in general, military necessity does not include any act of hostility which makes the return to peace unnecessarily difficult.

The rule says:

It admits of deception, but disclaims acts of perfidy.

That also follows the prohibition of the use of poison, with which it is associated.

Now, perfidy is defined later in paragraph 117, which declares:

It is justly considered an act of bad faith, of infamy, or fiendishness to deceive the enemy by flags of protection. * * *

Paragraph 65 is:

The use of the enemy's national standard, flag, or other emblem of nationality for the purpose of deceiving the enemy in battle is an act of perfidy. * * *

Is not the uniform an emblem of nationality? If it be an act of perfidy—the use of that emblem of nationality to deceive the enemy in battle—is it any less an act of perfidy to use it to steal upon him and deceive him when he is not in battle and is in his own quarters?

This is also prohibited by the convention of The Hague, which must have been well known to all our officers, which had been signed by the representatives of this Government, although its formal approval by the Senate took place this winter.

I suppose if it be perfidy now, according to the unanimous opinion of the Senate, and was perfidy before, according to the concurrent action of 24 great nations, the question when we formally ratified the treaty becomes unimportant.

Article 23 of the convention declares:

(f) To make improper use of a flag of truce, the national flag, or military ensigns, and the enemy's uniform—is specially prohibited. That is classed in that article also with the use of poison and poisoned arms.

So, Mr. President, the act of General Funston—not General Funston himself, if he acted under orders of his superior—but the act of General Funston is stamped with indelible infamy by Abraham Lincoln's articles of war, to which the Secretary of War appeals, and the concurrent action of 24 great nations, and the unanimous action of the Senate this winter.

Let me repeat a little: What is an act of perfidy, as distinguished from the deception which General MacArthur thinks appropriate to all war, as defined by both these great and commanding authorities?

That is defined in paragraph 65, which declares that—

The use of the enemy's national standard, flag, or other emblem of nationality for the purpose of deceiving the enemy in battle is an act of perfidy, by which they lose all claim to the protection of the law of war.

If that be true, is it less an act of perfidy to use the uniform of the enemy—his emblem of nationality—to steal upon him when no battle is going on?

One hundred and seventeen is to like effect:

It is justly considered an act of bad faith, of infamy, or fiendishness to deceive the enemy by a flag of protection. Such act of bad faith may be good cause for refusing to respect such flag.

Such deception is of the same kind as that practiced on the unsuspecting Aguinaldo, which the rule "justly," as it declares, "considers an act of infamy or fiendishness."

Rule 60 is:

It is against the usage of modern war to resolve, in hatred and revenge, to give no quarter.

Observe this is not justified even by revenge.

No body of troops has the right to declare that it will not give, and therefore will not accept, quarter.

56. A prisoner of war is subject to no punishment for being a public enemy, nor is any revenge wreaked upon him by the intentional infliction of any suffering or disgrace, by cruel imprisonment, want of food, by mutilation, death, or any other barbarity.

So, Mr. President, in this attempt to force your sovereignty by this process of benevolent assimilation, we have been brought to the unexampled dishonor of disregarding our own rules for the conduct of armies in the field and to disregard the rules to which our national faith has just been pledged to substantially all the civilized powers of the earth.

I understand the facts to be that this officer, with the approval of his superior officer, disguised himself or some of his men in the Filipino uniform, stole upon Aguinaldo unawares under that guise, deceived him by a forged letter representing that they were hungry, received food at his hands, and then threw him down and made him captive.

Now, if that be not the perfidy twice denounced and expressly ranked with poisoning and other like barbarities I can not understand the meaning of human language or the force of human conduct.

But this act of General Funston's, approved by his superior officer, was in violation, not only of the laws of war, but of that law of hospitality which governs alike everywhere the civilized Christian or pagan wherever the light of chivalry has penetrated. He went to Aguinaldo under the pretense that he was ahungered, and Aguinaldo fed him. Was not that an act of perfidy? It violated the holy rite of hospitality which even the Oriental nations hold sacred?

In Scott's immortal romance of the Talisman, the Sultan Saladin interposes to prevent a criminal who had just committed a treacherous murder from partaking of his feast by striking off his head as he approached the banquet. "Had he murdered my father," said the Saladin to Richard Cœur de Lion, "and afterwards partaken of my bowl and cup, not a hair of his head could have been injured by me."

In this case it was not the host sparing the guest, it was not Conrad de Montserat partaking of the bowl and the cup of Saladin, but it was the guest who had partaken of the hospitality of the host who betrayed his benefactor, and in doing it represented the United States of America in the Philippines.

Mr. President, the story of what has been called the water torture has been, in part, told by other Senators. I have no inclination to repeat the story. I can not help believing that not a twentieth part of it has yet been told. I get letters in large numbers from officers, or the friends of officers, who repeat what they tell me, all testifying to these cruelties. And yet as in the case cited by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] the other day the officer, or the officer's friends or kindred, who send the letters to me, send them under a strict injunction of secrecy. Other Senators tell me they have a like experience. These brave officers, who would go to the cannon's mouth for honor, who never flinch in battle, flinch before what they deem the certain ruin of their prospects in life if they give the evidence which they think would be distasteful to their superiors. I do not undertake to judge of this matter. Other Senators can judge as well as I can. The American people can do it better.

I suppose, Mr. President, that those of us who are of English descent like to think that the race from which we come will compare favorably with most others in the matter of humanity. Yet history is full of the terrible cruelties committed by Englishmen when men of other races refused to submit to their authority. I think my friends who seek to extenuate this water torture, or to apologize for it, may perhaps like to look at the precedent of the dealings with the Irish rebels in 1799.

In Howell's State Trials there will be found the proceedings in a suit by Mr. Wright against James Judkin Fitzgerald, a sheriff, who ordered a citizen to be flogged for the purpose of extorting information. I believe 50 lashes were administered and then 50 more by Fitzgerald, and in many other cases the same course was taken. It was wholly to extract information, as this water torture has been to get information. Fitzgerald, the sheriff, told his own story. He pointed out the necessity of his system of terror. He said he got one man he had flogged to confess that the plaintiff was a secretary of the United Irishmen, and this information he could not get from him before; that Mr. Wright himself had offered to confess, but his memory had been so impaired by the flogging that he could not command the faculty of recollection. Notwithstanding he had by the terror of his name and the severity of his flogging succeeded most astonishingly, particularly in one instance, where, by the flogging of one man, he and 36 others acknowledged themselves United Irishmen.

Now, that was abundantly proved; and the sheriff who had tortured and flogged these men who were only fighting that Ireland should not be ruled without the consent of the governed had the effrontery to ask for an act of indemnity from the

House of Commons against the damages which had been recovered against him, and that claim found plenty of advocates. The ministry undertook to extenuate the action of this monster by citing the cruelties which the Irish people had inflicted in their turn, and by saying that very material discoveries were made relative to concealed arms as the result of these tortures. The defenders of the administration said the most essential service had been rendered to the State and to the country by Mr. Fitzgerald. The attorney-general trusted the House would cheerfully accede to the prayer of the petition. Mr. Wright, the man who had been tortured, was a man of excellent character and education, and a teacher of the French language. As soon as he knew there were charges against him he went to the house of the defendant to give himself up and demand a trial. I will not take the time of the Senate to read the debates. The argument for the Government would do very well for some of the arguments we have heard here, and the arguments we have heard here would have done very well there. The House passed a general bill to indemnify all sheriffs and magistrates who had acted for the suppression of the rebellion in a way not warranted by law, and to secure them against actions at law for so doing. The sole question at stake was the right of torture to extort information. The bill passed the House, and afterwards Fitzgerald got a considerable pension, and was created a baronet of the United Kingdom.

Now, I agree that this precedent, so far as it may be held to have set an example for what has been done in the Philippine Islands, may be cited against me. I cite it only to show that such things are inevitable when you undertake by brute force to reduce to subjection an unwilling people, and that, therefore, when you enter upon that undertaking you yourselves take the responsibility for everything that follows.

Mr. President, it is said that these horrors which never would have come to the public knowledge had not the Senate ordered this investigation, were unknown to our authorities at home. I hope and believe they were unknown to the War Department. I know they were unknown to President Roosevelt, and I know they were unknown to President McKinley. But I can not think, perhaps I am skeptical, that the recent declaration of that honorable gentleman, the Secretary of War, made on a memorable occasion, that the war on our part has been conducted with unexampled humanity, will be accepted by his countrymen.

Let us not be diverted from the true issue. We are not talking of retaliation. We are not talking of the ordinary brutalities of war. We are not talking about or inquiring into acts of vengeance committed in the heat of battle. We are talking about torture, torture—cold-blooded, deliberate, calculated torture; torture to extort information. Claverhouse did it to the Scotch Covenanters with the boot and thumb-screw. It has never since till now been done by a man who spoke English except in Ireland. The Spanish inquisition did it with the slow fire and the boiling oil. It is said that the water torture was borrowed from Spain. I am quite ready to believe it. The men who make the inquiry are told that they are assailing the honor of the American Army. How do the defenders of the American Army meet the question? By denying the fact? No. By saying that the offenders have been detected and punished by military power? Some of these facts were reported to the War Department more than a year ago. So far as I can find there have been but two men tried for torture to extort information. They were two officers who hung up men by the thumbs, and they were found guilty. The general officer who approved the finding said "that they had dishonored and degraded the American Army," and then they were sent back to their command with a reprimand. I agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that the men who have stolen, and committed assaults for the gratification of brutal lusts have been punished, and punished severely.

My honorable friend from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] said something about this matter the other day. That is the only case of a punishment to be found in our records so far as I have seen them. I agree with my friend from Wisconsin that the men who have stolen and committed assaults for the gratification of brutal lusts have been punished, and punished severely, but what we are talking about is torture.

Mr. SPOONER. Did I say anything about the number?

Mr. HOAR. The Senator said there were two or three hundred cases, quoting the record before him.

Mr. CARMACK. Was it not the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]?

Mr. HOAR. No; it was the Senator from Wisconsin, unless my memory deceives me. I will change it if I am mistaken, but I think I am not mistaken.

We are talking about torture committed in the open day by men who were not drunk, but sober; men who had not just come out of battle, but torture for the purpose of getting information, on which, according to one of this committee, the tribunals acted.

What we are talking about is the torture committed in the presence of numerous witnesses for the purpose of extorting information, and orders from high authority to depopulate whole districts, and to slay all inhabitants, including all boys over 10 years old.

Is it denied that these things have been done? Is it denied that although you are still on the threshold of this inquiry, and have only called such witnesses as you happen to find 10,000 miles away from the scene, that these things have been proved to the satisfaction of the majority of the committee, and that no man has yet been punished, although they were going on considerably more than a year ago? Now, how do our friends who seek, I will not say to defend, but to extenuate them, deal with the honor of the American Army? Why, they come into the Senate and say that there have been other cruelties and barbarities and atrocities in war. When these American soldiers and officers are called to the bar our friends summon Nero and Torquemada and the Spanish inquisition and the sheeted and ghostly leaders of the Ku Klux Klan and put them by their side. That is the way you defend the honor of the American Army. It is the first time the American soldier was put into such company by the men who have undertaken his defense.

It has been shown, I think, in the investigation now going on that the secretary of the province of Batangas declared that one-third of the 300,000 of the population of that province have died within two years—100,000 men and women.

The Boston Journal, an eminent Republican paper and a most able supporter of the imperialistic policy, printed on the 3d of May, 1901, an interview with Gen. James M. Bell, given to the New York Times—not the General Bell who has been discussed here, but Gen. James M. Bell is his name, an officer who came back from the Philippines in May, 1901.

Mr. SPOONER. James F. Bell is the one there now.

Mr. LODGE. James Franklin Bell.

Mr. HOAR. This one is James M. Bell, unless I have the initials wrong. I have taken great pains to make inquiry. I have heard from the man to whom the interview was given, a newspaper correspondent of high character, and I have applied to the gentlemen of the Boston Journal to know if they ever heard it contradicted. He said in May, 1901, and he advocated the policy in the interview, too, that one-sixth of the natives of Luzon have either been killed or have died of the dengue fever in the last two years. Now, what is the population of Luzon? It is about 3,000,000, is it not?

Mr. ALLISON. That or thereabouts.

Mr. HOAR. Then one-sixth is 500,000.

I suppose that this dengue fever and the sickness which depopulated Batangas is the direct result of the war, and comes from the condition of starvation and bad food which the war has caused. The other provinces have not been heard from. If this be true we have caused the death of more human beings in the Philippines than we have caused to our enemies, including insurgents in the terrible civil war, in all our other wars put together. The general adds that—

the loss of life by killing alone has been very great, but I think not one man has been slain except where his death served the legitimate purposes of war. It has been necessary to adopt what in other countries would probably be thought harsh measures, for the Filipino is tricky and crafty and has to be fought in his own way.

I have made careful inquiry and I am satisfied that this interview is genuine. Now, all this is because you will not tell what you mean to do in the future, as I understand it.

Where did this order to make Samar a howling wilderness originate? The responsibility unquestionably, according to the discipline of armies in the field, rests with the highest authority from which it came.

We used to talk, some of us, about the horrors of Andersonville, and other things that were done during the civil war. We hope, all of us, never to hear them mentioned again. But is there anything in them worse than that which an officer of high rank in the Army, vouched for by a Senator on this floor, from personal knowledge, as a man of the highest honor and veracity, writes about the evils of these reconcentrado camps in the Philippine Islands? Now all this cost, all these young men gone to their graves, all these wrecked lives, all this national dishonor, the repeal of the Declaration of Independence, the overthrow of the principle on which the Monroe doctrine was placed by its author, the devastation of provinces, the shooting of captives, the torture of prisoners and of unarmed and peaceful citizens, the hanging men up by the thumbs, the carloads of maniac soldiers that you bring home are all because you would not tell and will not tell now whether you mean in the future to stand on the principles which you and your fathers always declared in the past.

The Senator from Ohio says it is not wise to declare what we will do at some future time. Mr. President, we do not ask you to declare what you will do at some future time. We ask you to declare an eternal principle good at the present time and good

at all times. We ask you to reaffirm it, because the men most clamorous in support of what you are doing deny it. That principle, if you act upon it, prevents you from crushing out a weak nation, because of your fancied interest now or hereafter. It prevents you from undertaking to judge what institutions are fit for other nations on the poor plea that you are the strongest. We are asking you at least to go no further than to declare what you would not do now or hereafter, and the reason for declaring it is that half of you declare you will hold this people in subjection and the other half on this matter are dumb. You declared what you would not do at some future time when you all voted that you would not take Cuba against the will of her people, did you not? We ask you to declare not at what moment you will get out of the Philippine Islands, but only on what eternal principle you will act, in them or out of them. Such declarations are made in all history. They are made in every important treaty between nations.

The Constitution of the United States is itself but a declaration of what this country will do and what it will not do in all future times. The Declaration of Independence, if it have the practical meaning it has had for a hundred years, is a declaration of what this country would do through all future times. The Monroe Doctrine, to which sixteen republics south of us owe their life and their safety, was a declaration to mankind of what we would do in all future time. Among all the shallow pretenses of imperialism this statement that we will not say what we will do in the future is the most shallow of all. Was there ever such a flimsy pretext flaunted in the face of the American people as that of gentlemen who say, If any other nation on the face of the earth or all other nations together attempt to overthrow the independence of any people to the south of us in this hemisphere, we will fight and prevent them, and at the same time think it dishonorable to declare whether we will ever overthrow the independence of a weaker nation in another hemisphere.

If we take your view of it we have crushed out the only republic in Asia and put it under our heel and we are now at war with the only Christian people in the East. Even, as I said, the Senator from Ohio admits they are a people, he only says there are several peoples and not one, as if the doctrine that one people has no right to buy sovereignty over another, or to rule another against its will, did not apply in the plural number. You can not crush out an unwilling people, or buy sovereignty over them, or treat them as spoils of conquest, or booty of battle in the singular, or at retail, but you have a perfect right to do it by wholesale. Suppose there are several peoples in the Philippines. They have population enough to make a hundred and twelve States of the size of Rhode Island or Delaware when they adopted the Constitution.

I suppose, according to this modern doctrine, that if, when the Holy Alliance threatened to reduce the colonies which had thrown off the yoke of Spain in South America, not a wit more completely than the Philippine people had thrown off the yoke of Spain in Asia, if they had undertaken to subdue them all at once, John Quincy Adams and James Monroe would have held their peace and would at least have said it was not wise to say what we would do in the future. If we had the right to protect nascent republics from the tyranny of other people and to declare that we would do it in the future, and if need be would encounter the whole continent of Europe single-handed in that case, is it any less fitting to avow that we will protect such peoples from ourselves? How is it that these gentlemen who will not tell you what they will do in the future in regard to the Philippine Islands were so eager and greedy to tell you what they would do and what they would not do in the case of Cuba when we first declared war on Spain? You can make no distinction between these two cases except by having a motive, which I do not for one moment impute, that when you made war upon Spain you were afraid of Europe, if you did not make the declaration.

These people are given to us as children, to lead them out of their childhood into manhood. They were docile and affectionate in the beginning. But they needed your kindness and justice, and a respect in them for the rights we claimed for ourselves, and the rights we had declared always were inherent in all mankind. You preferred force to kindness, and power to justice, and war to peace, and pride to generosity.

You said you would not treat with a man with arms in his hands. You have come, instead, to torture him when he was unarmed and defenseless. Yet you said you would make his conduct the measure of your own; that if he lied to you, you would lie to him; that if he were cruel to you, you would be cruel to him; that if he were a savage, you would be a savage also. You held an attitude toward him which you hold to no strong or to no civilized power. You decorate an officer for the capture of Aguinaldo by treachery, and the next week ratify The Hague convention and denounce such action, and classify it with poisoning and breaking of faith.

You tell us, Mr. President, that the Philippine people have practiced some cruelties themselves. The investigation has not yet gone far enough to enable you to tell which side begun these atrocities. One case which one of the members of the majority of the committee told the Senate the other day was well established by proving that it occurred long before April, 1901, and was so published, far and wide, in the press of this country at that time. I do not learn that there was any attempt to investigate it, either by the War Department or by Congress, until the beginning of the present session of Congress. But suppose they did begin it. Such things are quite likely to occur when weakness is fighting for its rights against strength. Is their conduct any excuse for ours? The Philippine people is but a baby in the hands of our Republic. The young athlete, the giant, the Hercules, the Titan, forces a fight upon a boy 10 years old and then blames the little fellow because he hits below the belt.

I see that my enthusiastic friend from North Carolina seeks to break the force of these revelations by saying that they are only what some Americans are wont to do at home. It is benevolent assimilation over again. It is just what the junior Senator from Indiana predicted. He thought we should conduct affairs in the Philippine Islands so admirably that we should pattern our domestic administration on that model. But did I understand that the Senator from North Carolina proposes, if his charge against the Democrats there is true, to make North Carolina a howling wilderness, or to burn populous towns of 10,000 people, to get the people of North Carolina into reconcentration camps, and to slay every male child over 10 years old? I know nothing about the truth of the Senator's charges. They have never been investigated by the Senate so far. We had some painful investigations years ago by committees in this body and of the other House, notably one of which the senior Senator from Colorado was chairman. But I never heard that you undertook to apply to Americans the methods which, if not justified, at least are sought to be extenuated, in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. President, if the stories which come to me in private from officers of the Army and from the kindred and friends of soldiers are to be trusted; if the evidence which seems to be just beginning before the Senate Committee can be trusted, there is nothing in the conduct of Spain in Cuba worse than the conduct of Americans in the Philippine Islands. If this evidence be true, and nobody is as yet ready to deny it, and Spain were strong enough, she would have the right to-morrow to wrest the Philippine Islands from our grasp on grounds as good, if not better, than those which justified us when we made war upon her. The United States is a strong and powerful country—the strongest and most powerful on earth, as we love to think. But it is the first time in the history of this people for nearly three hundred years when we had to appeal to strength and not to the righteousness of our cause to maintain our position in a great debate of justice and liberty.

Gentlemen tell us that the Filipinos are savages, that they have inflicted torture, that they have dishonored our dead and outraged the living. That very likely may be true. Spain said the same thing of the Cubans. We have made the same charges against our own countrymen in the disturbed days after the war. The reports of committees and the evidence in the documents in our library are full of them. But who ever heard before of an American gentleman, or an American, who took as a rule for his own conduct the conduct of his antagonist, or who claimed that the Republic should act as savages because she had savages to deal with? I had supposed, Mr. President, that the question, whether a gentleman shall lie or murder or torture, depended on his sense of his own character, and not on his opinion of his victim. Of all the miserable sophistical shifts which have attended this wretched business from the beginning, there is none more miserable than this.

You knew—men are held to know what they ought to know in morals and in the conduct of States—and you knew that this people would resist you; you knew you were to have a war; you knew that if they were civilized, so far as they were civilized and like you, the war would be conducted after the fashion of civilized warfare, and that so far as they were savage the war would be conducted on their part after the fashion of savage warfare; and you knew also that if they resisted and held out, their soldiers would be tempted to do what they have done, and would yield to that temptation.

And I tell you, Mr. President, that if you do not disregard the lessons of human nature thus far, and do not retrace your steps and set an example of another conduct, you will have and those who follow you will have a like experience hereafter. You may pacify this country on the surface; you may make it a solitude, and call it peace; you may burn towns; you may exterminate populations; you may kill the children or the boys over 10, as Herod slew the firstborn of the Israelites. But the volcano will be there. You will not settle this thing in a generation or in a

century or in ten centuries, until it is settled right. It never will be settled right until you look for your counselors to George Washington and Thomas Jefferson and John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln, and not to the reports of the War Department.

There is much more I should like to say, but I have spoken too long already. I have listened to what many gentlemen have said—gentlemen whom I love and honor—with profound sorrow. They do over again in the Senate what Burke complained of to the House of Commons.

In order to prove that the Americans have no right to their liberties we are every day endeavoring to subvert the maxims which preserve the whole spirit of our own. To prove that the Americans ought not to be free we are obliged to depreciate the value of freedom itself; and we never seem to gain a paltry advantage over them in debate without attacking some of those principles or deriding some of those feelings for which our ancestors have shed their blood.

I wish to cite another weighty maxim from Burke:

America, gentlemen say, is a noble object—it is an object well worth fighting for. Certainly it is, if fighting a people be the best way of gaining them. Gentlemen in this respect will be led to their choice of means by their complexions and their habits. Those who understand the military art will of course have some predilection for it. Those who wield the thunder of the state may have more confidence in the efficacy of arms. But I confess, possibly for the want of this knowledge, my opinion is much more in favor of prudent management than of force—considering force not as an odious, but a feeble instrument, for preserving a people so numerous, so active, so growing, so spirited as this, in a profitable connection with us.

There is nothing—

Says Gibbon, the historian of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire—

more adverse to nature and reason than to hold in obedience remote countries and foreign nations in opposition to their inclination and interest. A torrent of barbarians may pass over the earth, but an extensive empire must be supported by a refined system of policy and oppression; in the center, an absolute power, prompt in action and rich in resources; a swift and easy communication with the extreme parts; fortifications to check the first effort of rebellion; a regular administration to protect and punish; and a well-disciplined army to inspire fear, without provoking discontent and despair.

Lord Elgin, Governor-General of India and formerly Governor-General of Canada, well known and highly esteemed in the United States, declared as the result of his experience in the East: "It is a terrible business, however—this living among inferior races. I have seldom from man or woman since I came to the East heard a sentence which was reconcilable with the hypothesis that Christianity had ever come into the world. Detestation, contempt, ferocity, vengeance, whether Chinamen or Indians be the object. One moves among them with perfect indifference, treating them not as dogs, because in that case one would whistle to them and pat them, but as machines with which one can have no communion or sympathy. When the passions of fear and hatred are ingrafted on this indifference, the result is frightful—an absolute callousness as to the sufferings of the objects of those passions, which must be witnessed to be understood and believed."

The glowing narrative of Macaulay, the eloquence of Burke and Sheridan have made the crimes committed in India under the rule of Warren Hastings familiar to mankind. Yet I believe the verdict of history has acquitted Hastings, as the tribunal that tried him acquitted him. He was dismissed, exculpated, from the bar of the House of Lords, and decorated. He was sworn of the Privy Council and received at court. A large purse was made up for him by the East India Company. Yet no man doubts the truth of Burke's terrible indictment. He was acquitted because England, and not he, was the criminal. When England undertook to assert her rule in India what followed was the inevitable consequence of the decision.

Lord Erskine, the foremost advocate who ever spoke the English tongue on English soil, placed with unerring sagacity the defense of Hastings on this ground alone. He admitted that Hastings, in ruling India, "may, and must, have offended against the laws of God and nature." "If he was the faithful viceroy of an empire wrested in blood from the people to whom God and nature had given it, he may and must have preserved that unjust dominion over timorous and abject nations by a terrifying superiority." "A government having no root in consent or affection, no foundation in similarity of interests, nor support from any one principle which cements men in society together could only be upheld by alternate stratagem and force." Erskine adds: "To be governed at all, they must be governed with a rod of iron; and our empire in the East would long since have been lost to Great Britain if civil skill and military prowess had not united their efforts to support an authority which Heaven never gave—by means which it never can sanction."

Mr. President, this is the eternal law of human nature. You may struggle against it, you may try to escape it, you may persuade yourself that your intentions are benevolent, that your yoke will be easy and your burden will be light, but it will assert itself again and again. Government without the consent of the governed—an authority which Heaven never gave—can only be supported by means which Heaven never can sanction.

The American people have got this one question to answer.

They may answer it now; they can take ten years, or twenty years, or a generation, or a century to think of it. But it will not down. They must answer it in the end—Can you lawfully buy with money, or get by brute force of arms, the right to hold in subjugation an unwilling people, and to impose on them such constitution as you, and not they, think best for them?

We have answered this question a good many times in the past. The fathers answered it in 1776, and founded the Republic upon their answer, which has been the corner stone. John Quincy Adams and James Monroe answered it again in the Monroe doctrine, which John Quincy Adams declared was only the doctrine of the consent of the governed. The Republican party answered it when it took possession of the forces of Government at the beginning of the most brilliant period in all legislative history. Abraham Lincoln answered it when, on that fatal journey to Washington in 1861, he announced that the doctrine of the consent of the governed was the cardinal doctrine of his political creed, and declared, with prophetic vision, that he was ready to be assassinated for it if need be. You answered it again yourselves when you said that Cuba, who had no more title than the people of the Philippine Islands had to their independence, of right ought to be free and independent.

The question will be answered again hereafter. It will be answered soberly and deliberately and quietly as the American people are wont to answer great questions of duty. It will be answered, not in any turbulent assembly, amid shouting and clapping of hands and stamping of feet, where men do their thinking with their heels and not with their brains. It will be answered in the churches and in the schools and in the colleges; and it will be answered in fifteen million American homes, and it will be answered as it has always been answered. It will be answered right.

A famous orator once imagined the nations of the world uniting to erect a column to Jurisprudence in some stately capital. Each country was to bring the name of its great jurist to be inscribed on the side of the column, with a sentence stating what he and his country through him had done toward establishing the reign of law in justice for the benefit of mankind.

Rome said, "Here is Numa, who received the science of law from the nymph Egeria in the cavern and taught its message to his countrymen." Here is Justinian, who first reduced law to a code, made its precepts plain, so that all mankind could read it, and laid down the rules which should govern the dealing of man with man in every transaction of life."

France said, "Here is D'Aguesseau, the great chancellor, to whose judgment seat pilgrims from afar were wont to repair to do him reverence."

England said, "Here is Erskine, who made it safe for men to print the truth, no matter what tyrant might dislike to read it."

Virginia said, "Here is Marshall, who breathed the vital principle into the Constitution, infused into it, instead of the letter that killeth, the spirit that maketh alive, and enabled it to keep State and nation each in its appointed bounds, as the stars abide in their courses."

I have sometimes fancied that we might erect here in the capital of the country a column to American Liberty which alone might rival in height the beautiful and simple shaft which we have erected to the fame of the Father of the Country. I can fancy each generation bringing its inscription, which should recite its own contribution to the great structure of which the column should be but the symbol.

The generation of the Puritan and the Pilgrim and the Huguenot claims the place of honor at the base. "I brought the torch of Freedom across the sea. I cleared the forest. I subdued the savage and the wild beast. I laid in Christian liberty and law the foundations of empire."

The next generation says: "What my fathers founded I builded. I left the seashore to penetrate the wilderness. I planted schools and colleges and courts and churches."

Then comes the generation of the great colonial day. "I stood by the side of England on many a hard-fought field. I helped humble the power of France. I saw the lilies go down before the lion at Louisbourg and Quebec. I carried the cross of St. George in triumph in Martinique and the Havana. I knew the stormy pathways of the ocean. I followed the whale from the Arctic to the Antarctic seas, among tumbling mountains of ice and under equinoctial heat, as the great English orator said, 'No sea not vexed by my fisheries; no climate not witness to my toils.'"

Then comes the generation of the Revolutionary time. "I encountered the power of England. I declared and won the Independence of my country. I placed that declaration on the eternal principles of justice and righteousness which all mankind have read, and on which all mankind will one day stand. I affirmed the dignity of human nature and the right of the people to govern themselves. I devised the securities against popular haste and delusion which made that right secure. I created the Supreme Court and the Senate. For the first time in history I made the

right of the people to govern themselves safe, and established institutions for that end which will endure forever."

The next generation says, "I encountered England again. I vindicated the right of an American ship to sail the seas the wide world over without molestation. I made the American sailor as safe at the ends of the earth as my fathers had made the American farmer safe in his home. I proclaimed the Monroe doctrine in the face of the Holy Alliance, under which 16 Republics have joined the family of nations. I filled the Western Hemisphere with Republics from the Lakes to Cape Horn, each controlling its own destiny in safety and in honor."

Then comes the next generation: "I did the mighty deeds which in your younger years you saw and which your fathers told. I saved the Union. I put down the rebellion. I freed the slave. I made of every slave a freeman, and of every freeman a citizen, and of every citizen a voter."

Then comes another who did the great work in peace, in which so many of you had an honorable share: "I kept the faith. I paid the debt. I brought in conciliation and peace instead of war. I secured in the practice of nations the great Doctrine of Expatriation. I devised the Homestead system. I covered the prairie and the plain with happy homes and with mighty States. I crossed the continent and joined together the seas with my great railroads. I declared the manufacturing independence of America, as my fathers affirmed its political independence. I built up our vast domestic commerce. I made my country the richest, freest, strongest, happiest people on the face of the earth."

And now what have we to say? What have we to say? Are we to have a place in that honorable company? Must we engrave on that column, "We repealed the Declaration of Independence. We changed the Monroe doctrine from a doctrine of eternal righteousness and justice, resting on the consent of the governed, to a doctrine of brutal selfishness, looking only to our own advantage. We crushed the only republic in Asia. We made war on the only Christian people in the East. We converted a war of glory to a war of shame. We vulgarized the American flag. We introduced perfidy into the practice of war. We inflicted torture on unarmed men to extort confession. We put children to death. We established reconcentrado camps. We devastated provinces. We baffled the aspirations of a people for liberty."

No, Mr. President. Never! Never! Other and better counsels will yet prevail. The hours are long in the life of a great people. The irrevocable step is not yet taken.

Let us at least have this to say: We too have kept the faith of the Fathers. We took Cuba by the hand. We delivered her from her age-long bondage. We welcomed her to the family of nations. We set mankind an example never beheld before of moderation in victory. We led hesitating and halting Europe to the deliverance of their beleaguered ambassadors in China. We marched through a hostile country—a country cruel and barbarous—without anger or revenge. We returned benefit for injury, and pity for cruelty. We made the name of America beloved in the East as in the West. We kept faith with the Philippine people. We kept faith with our own history. We kept our national honor unsullied. The flag which we received without a rent we handed down without a stain. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to remind Senators that the manifestations of applause are in violation of the rules of the Senate, and that those rules can not be enforced in the galleries if they are neglected on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BACON. I think it should be noted that the main applause was on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what the Chair was calling attention to—a violation of the rules of the Senate on the floor. Mr. FORAKER. And on the Democratic side.

Mr. BACON. I beg pardon of the Chair. I did not know that the Chair had noticed the fact which he has just stated. I thought the Chair was reproving the occupants of the galleries, and I wished the Senate to take the responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair took occasion to remark that the rules could not be enforced in the galleries unless they were observed by Senators.

Mr. BACON. That is all right.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1172) granting an increase of pension to Catharine F. Edmunds.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution: A bill (H. R. 6330) granting an increase of pension to William D. Tanner;

A bill (H. R. 12418) granting a pension to Matilda E. Clarke; and

A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 113) authorizing the use and improvement of Governors Island, Boston Harbor.

The message further announced that the House had passed with amendments the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (S. 2296) to amend an act approved March 2, 1895, relating to public printing;

A bill (S. 2782) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Washington and Oregon Railway Company;

A bill (S. 3908) granting homesteaders on the abandoned Fort Bridger, Fort Sanders, and Fort Laramie military reservations, in Wyoming, the right to purchase one-quarter section of public land on said reservations as pasture or grazing lands; and

A bill (S. 4264) providing that the statute of limitations of the several States shall apply as a defense to actions brought in any courts for the recovery of lands patented under the treaty of May 10, 1854, between the United States of America and the Shawnee tribe of Indians.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 10299) authorizing the Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company to sell or lease its railroad property and franchises, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 11657) allowing the construction of a dam across the St. Lawrence River;

A bill (H. R. 14109) to authorize the Macon Ice, Light, and Power Company to construct certain improvements on the Noxubee River, in the State of Mississippi;

A bill (H. R. 14189) to permit the occupancy of the public-printing building by the Grand Army of the Republic; and

A bill (H. R. 14411) to regulate commutation for good conduct for United States prisoners.

The message further requested the Senate to reconsider the vote whereby it passed the bill (H. R. 12576) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wells.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 5406) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River from the mainland of Aiken County, S. C., to the mainland of Richmond County, Ga.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the resolution of the Senate to correct an error in the enrollment of the bill (S. 593) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a National Sanitarium of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

A bill (S. 173) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscola* and cargo;

A bill (S. 3129) for the authorization of the erection of buildings by the international committee of Young Men's Christian Associations on military reservations of the United States;

A bill (S. 3666) to authorize the sale of a part of the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, in the State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 3848) granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain land in the city of Newport, R. I.;

A bill (H. R. 8466) granting a pension to Lucinda A. Sirwell;

A bill (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8921) granting increase of pension to Jesse C. Rhodaback;

A bill (H. R. 9226) granting a pension to Elizabeth I. Ogden;

A bill (H. R. 9249) granting a pension to Amos Allport;

A bill (H. R. 9437) granting increase of pension to Elias A. Calkins;

A bill (H. R. 9569) granting increase of pension to Albert Deits;

A bill (H. R. 9926) granting increase of pension to James F. Patton;

A bill (H. R. 9928) granting a pension to Benjamin E. Styles;

A bill (H. R. 10165) granting increase of pension to Delia E. Slocum;

A bill (H. R. 10201) granting increase of pension to Otis R. Freeman;

A bill (H. R. 10731) granting increase of pension to Samuel P. Milburn;

A bill (H. R. 11285) granting increase of pension to William Sheldon;

A bill (H. R. 11343) granting a pension to Mary Louise Lowry;

A bill (H. R. 11644) granting a pension to Edgar A. Hamilton;

A bill (H. R. 11921) granting increase of pension to George W. De Graw;

A bill (H. R. 12012) granting increase of pension to Walter C. Tuttle;

A bill (H. R. 12458) granting increase of pension to William M. Barstow;

A bill (H. R. 12562) granting increase of pension to William H. Temple;

A bill (H. R. 12685) granting a pension to Hiram J. Springfield;

A bill (H. R. 12778) granting increase of pension to Edward R. Blain;

A bill (H. R. 12780) granting increase of pension to William H. Wheeler;

A bill (H. R. 13132) granting increase of pension to Annie Cotter;

A bill (H. R. 13162) granting increase of pension to Augustin M. Adams;

A bill (H. R. 13249) granting increase of pension to Ada Trowbridge;

A bill (H. R. 13265) granting increase of pension to John Whalen;

A bill (H. R. 13268) granting increase of pension to Elbert N. Remson;

A bill (H. R. 13350) granting a pension to Presley P. Medlin;

A bill (H. R. 13503) granting increase of pension to Charles Haltenhof;

A bill (H. R. 13807) granting a pension to Jeremiah Horan;

A bill (H. R. 13822) granting a pension to Hannah T. Knowles;

A bill (H. R. 14099) granting a pension to Samantha B. Van Brocklin; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 46) to provide for the printing of 6,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1901, inclusive.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. DUBOIS. I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if there is anyone on his side of the Chamber who desires to speak?

Mr. LODGE. No; there is nobody on this side. The Senator knows that the Senators on this side who were to speak have spoken, except the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no amendment pending. If there are no amendments to be offered as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. The understanding certainly was—although there was not an understanding about the time—that the debate should proceed continuously. The understanding was with the Senator from Idaho and was made in open Senate. I supposed, of course, some one on the other side would be ready to go on to-day.

Mr. DUBOIS. There are Senators on our side who desire to go on, and they will do so. I myself intended to speak day before yesterday and yesterday, but I am not ready to go on this afternoon. The Senator from Colorado is ready.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not think anybody ought to be required to go on for at least some little time. There are a number of Senators who desire to be absent from the Chamber for twenty or thirty minutes; and I move that the Senate take a recess for thirty minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado moves that the Senate take a recess for thirty minutes.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to that, unless the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] would like to dispose of his conference report.

Mr. HALE. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not call up the report at the present time.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be glad, unless the Senator from Vermont desires to go on with his conference report, to have the Senate take a recess, as suggested.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator from Vermont desires to call up the report, I hope he will. I did not know that he wished to do so.

Mr. PROCTOR. I have no desire to hasten it. I think it is well that it lie over for a day, certainly.

Mr. TELLER. If the proposition as to a recess is objectionable to the Senator from Massachusetts, I will withdraw it.

Mr. LODGE. It is not in the least. The motion the Senator proposes will be extremely convenient to me personally.

Mr. TELLER. And to some others.

Mr. LODGE. And to a number of other Senators, as I am well aware.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I should be very glad, so far as I am concerned, to have the Senate take the recess proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado, that the Senate take a recess for thirty minutes.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess for thirty minutes, at the expiration of which time it reassembled.

THOMAS WELLS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair takes this opportunity to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, May 22, 1902.

Whereas the House has been informed that since the passage of the bill (H. R. 12576) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wells the said Thomas Wells has died: Therefore,

Resolved, That the bill H. R. 12576 be transmitted to the Senate with the request that it reconsider the vote whereby it passed the said bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, as I understand the matter, the bill has not been signed by the presiding officer of either branch of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. GALLINGER. Under those circumstances it strikes me that the message is rather an extraordinary one. The other body could have finally disposed of the measure. I move that the matter lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR. Let the message be read again.

The Secretary again read the message from the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOAR. What is the position of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it is a House bill passed by the House; that it came to the Senate, and that the Senate concurred in its passage and returned it to the House with a statement of that action. The House enrolled the bill, but the enrolled bill was not signed by the Speaker, and now a resolution is passed by the House sending the bill back to the Senate and asking the Senate to reconsider the vote by which it was passed. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the message lie on the table.

Mr. HOAR. What becomes of the bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. It will lie there also.

Mr. HOAR. How does the message put the bill upon the table?

Mr. GALLINGER. The bill, if the Senator will permit me, is in the possession of the House of Representatives, if it has not been signed by the Speaker; and it strikes me the House can make a final disposition of it without instructing the Senate how to proceed to dispose of a House bill.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator is entirely right. The message then simply lies on the table and the House deals with the bill as it sees fit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

The motion was agreed to.

COLUMBIA RIVER BRIDGE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2782) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River by the Washington and Oregon Railway Company, which was, on page 2, line 19, to strike out "ten" and insert "six."

Mr. MITCHELL. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (H. R. 11657) allowing the construction of a dam across the St. Lawrence River; and

A bill (H. R. 14109) to authorize the Macon Ice, Light, and Power Company to construct certain improvements on the Noxubee River in the State of Mississippi.

The bill (H. R. 10299) authorizing the Santa Fe Pacific Railroad Company to sell or lease its railroad property and franchises, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

The bill (H. R. 14189) to permit the occupancy of the public-printing building by the Grand Army of the Republic was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

The bill (H. R. 14411) to regulate commutation for good conduct for United States prisoners was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LIEUTENANT ARNOLD AND SERGEANT EDWARDS.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has kindly yielded to me to offer a resolution for information on a matter relative to the Philippine question, for which I ask present consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent to offer a resolution. It will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate all official papers in his possession which relate to charges against Lieutenant Arnold and Sergeant Edwards by Private Andrew K. Weir, including the report of Capt. P. W. West, United States Army, of date August 21, 1901.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. FORAKER. I was about to make an inquiry. As the resolution was read I would suppose that it calls for the original papers. I do not suppose that the Senator wants to have the original papers sent from the War Department to the Senate. I rose to make that inquiry.

Mr. CULBERSON. The original papers, of course, are not desired, and the Secretary of War I think will properly construe the resolution to mean copies. I have no objection to inserting the word "copies."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. After the word "Senate" insert "copies of;" so as to read:

Send to the Senate copies of all official papers.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask that the resolution be read.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let it be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read as modified.

The Secretary read the resolution as modified, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate copies of all official papers in his possession which relate to charges against Lieutenant Arnold and Sergeant Edwards by Private Andrew K. Weir, including the report of Capt. P. W. West, United States Army, of date August 21, 1901.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to inquire if these charges resulted in a court-martial?

Mr. CULBERSON. I will state that my information is that certain charges were made by Andrew K. Weir against this officer and that a report thereon was made by Captain West. I am not advised as to whether a court-martial resulted or, if so, the result of the court-martial. The object of the resolution is to elicit those facts.

Mr. SPOONER. When was the resolution introduced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was just introduced.

Mr. SPOONER. I object to its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin objects to the present consideration of the resolution.

ASSAY OFFICE AT PORTLAND, OREG.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the Senator from Colorado yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask for the consideration of the bill (S. 641) to establish an assay office at Portland, Oreg.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TELLER. If there is to be no debate, I shall not object.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments, in line 11, after the word "thousand" to strike out "five hundred," and insert "two hundred and fifty;" in line 13, after the word "thousand" to strike out "five" and insert "four;" and in line 5, page 2, before the word "thousand" to strike out "twenty" and insert "fifteen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and required to establish an assay office of the United States at Portland, in the State of Oregon; said assay office to be conducted under the provisions of the act entitled "An act revising and amending the laws relating to the mints and assay offices and the coinage of the United States," approved February 12, 1873; that the officers of the assay offices shall be an assayer in charge, at a salary of \$2,250 per annum, who shall also perform the duties of melter; chief clerk, at a salary of \$1,400 per annum. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to rent a suitable building for the use of said assay office; and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$15,000 for salary of assayer in charge, chief clerk, and wages of workmen, rent, and contingent expenses.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2295) temporarily to provide for the admin-

istration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, as no one seems disposed to debate the merits or the demerits of the pending measure to-day, I wish to submit a few facts to the Senate, because it seems to me to be a proper time to do it, with reference to the proceedings of Congress when we entered upon the war with Spain. I do not intend to go into a thorough, detailed statement of what occurred, but at least several Senators in the course of the debate on the pending measure have referred to the declaration made in the bill we passed with reference to intervention and to the fourth resolution. The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] the other day referred to it as having been an embarrassing question for the Government during this whole treatment of the subject. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], who addressed us a day or two ago, referred to it also as an embarrassing question.

Mr. President, not being closely connected with the Administration, as those Senators are, I am not able to say that it was not an embarrassing feature, but I can not see how it was embarrassing, and I do not believe that it in any wise embarrassed the administration of public affairs.

The question what we should do with reference to the war in Cuba was before the Senate at least something like two years before we took any action. It was also before the House. It would be interesting to take the various resolutions, both in the House and in the Senate, commencing in 1896 and continuing up to 1898, when we made our final movement. I can not say how many resolutions were introduced, but I should say not less than forty or fifty all told. I have, I believe, gone over every one of them.

Mr. SPOONER. On Cuba?

Mr. TELLER. On Cuba, with reference to the war going on in Cuba, and with reference to our duties and our obligations. I believe I can say that every one that proposed anything to be done affirmatively by the Government of the United States went upon the theory that we were to encourage and aid the establishment of a free and independent government. I think I may say, without fear of contradiction, that every Senator who took the floor on that subject, either by resolution which he introduced, or by speeches which he made, committed himself to the doctrine that whatever we should do to get rid of Spain must eventuate in the independence of the island of Cuba.

In many cases it was declared that the purpose was to secure the establishment of the Republic of Cuba; in some cases it was simply an independent government, and in other cases the government then in existence was recognized and referred to—for instance, we said, "war having existed between Spain and the government which had been created and maintained in Cuba for some time," which meant, of course, the insurrectionary government there. When we came to finally act, there was a very strong and decided movement in this body in favor of recognizing the Republic of Cuba as it then existed; and I should like to say, Mr. President, that whilst I feel we are very happily out of the difficulties by which we were surrounded in Cuba, I believe now it would have been better if we had in the beginning recognized the independence of Cuba, as we have now recognized it. We have done that through the military power, and we have recognized the independence of the people of that island through the House of Representatives and through the Senate by the resolutions passed yesterday and the day before.

The President of the United States in an address made at a gathering in New York a day or two ago—on the 20th instant, I think—congratulated the people and congratulated the Government on the fact that we had carried out the promise we made in the spring of 1898, and that the people of Cuba had established, with our aid, a government.

Mr. President, I think that is a matter of congratulation. I do not know of anything which has occurred in my public life which has given me more pleasure than the result of our interference in Cuba, and the fulfillment of the pledge we made to those people. Before I proceed further, I want to say that nobody thought of anything else but independence for the island of Cuba.

I want now to say a word about the probable result, in my opinion, of the movement established and consummated on the 20th instant. I know it is said that the Latin race is a turbulent race, and that in Cuba they have some elements which are calculated perhaps to create friction between the races. That there may be danger of some kind of turbulence, I admit, but I feel morally certain that the Republic of Cuba has come to stay, to exist.

If, as has been sometimes suggested, Cuba is ever to be a part of the United States, the Supreme Court of the United States having declared that it is not now, it will be only when the people of that island indicate and express their desire to be admitted into the Union; but that is a question, in my judgment, so far in the future that it is not worth while now to consider it. I believe they will maintain peace and order, though that there may be occasional commotions there I have no doubt.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the action of Congress in 1896 with reference to this question. On the 28th of February, 1896—that was a little more than two years before our final action—the Senate passed this resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in the opinion of Congress, a condition of public war exists between the Government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba; and that the United States of America should maintain a strict neutrality between the contending powers, according to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.

That resolution came from the Committee on Foreign Relations; and that is a declaration, if it is possible to make a declaration, that there was a government in Cuba at that time.

On the floor of the Senate this amendment was made:

Resolved further, That the friendly offices of the United States should be offered by the President to the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

When the vote was taken on the adoption of that resolution, the yeas were 64 and the nays were 6. So it will be seen that the vote was practically unanimous.

It would be very interesting, Mr. President, if it were now but 12 or 1 o'clock in the day, to go over some of the speeches made by prominent members of this body. I think that no action of the Senate I can recall was conducted with more unanimity and with a more general agreement on all sides than this. I recall that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] made two speeches at some length on this subject, in which he took very decided ground in favor of a free government for Cuba, and I believe in every utterance he made he did the same. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] also took very decided ground; and the then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Thurston, was very active in the same direction. I think I might name almost all the members of the Senate who voted for this resolution in some shape or other and expressed their approval of it before the vote was taken.

That resolution went to the House of Representatives on the same day. The entire action can be found in the RECORD. When the resolution was read to the House of Representatives the RECORD shows that there was "loud applause." Later the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the House of Representatives reported a substitute for the Senate resolution. This was on the 2d day of March, 1896. The substitute resolution was as follows:

Resolved, That, in the opinion of Congress, a state of public war exists in Cuba, the parties to which are entitled to belligerent rights, and the United States should observe a strict neutrality between the belligerents.

Resolved, That Congress deplores the destruction of life and property caused by the war now waging in that island, and believing that the only permanent solution of the contest equally in the interest of Spain, the people of Cuba, and other nations would be in the establishment of a government by the choice of the people of Cuba, it is the sense of Congress that the Government of the United States should use its good offices and friendly influence to that end.

Resolved, That the United States has not intervened in struggles between any European Governments and their colonies on this continent; but from the very close relations between the people of the United States and those of Cuba in consequence of its proximity and the extent of the commerce between the two peoples the present war is entailing such losses upon the people of the United States that Congress is of opinion that the Government of the United States should be prepared to protect the legitimate interests of our citizens, by intervention if necessary.

Mr. President, the wording of that is different from the Senate resolution. Both of them recognized that there was to be an independent government of Cuba. In other words, we did not take the position that Spain should have any control over it, or should establish a better government, or anything of that kind. All our action looked to the ultimate and entire release of Cuba from Spanish domination; and nowhere at no time was there a suggestion which I can find in any of the speeches made—and I have gone over them with some care—by anyone, either in the House of Representatives or in the Senate of the United States, that we wanted any other relation than that which exists between us now, when Cuba is an independent Republic.

The House of Representatives on the same day voted on the proposition which I have just read, and the yeas were 263 and the nays 17. There was some disagreement between the two Houses. Finally a conference committee was appointed and an agreement was arrived at.

The resolution as it became a law, which it did on the 6th day of April, 1896, will be found in the twenty-ninth volume of the Statutes at Large, on page 10 of the appendix. It passed the Senate February 28, 1896, and passed the House of Representatives April 6, 1896. As it finally became a law it reads:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That, in the opinion of Congress, a condition of public war exists between the Government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba—

I call especial attention to the fact that everywhere we recognized the existence of a government of some kind in Cuba—and that the United States of America should maintain a strict neutrality between the contending powers, according to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.

Resolved further, That the friendly offices of the United States should be offered by the President to the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator kindly give me the reference to that?

Mr. TELLER. It will be found in volume 29 of the Statutes at Large, on page 10 of the appendix. I will send it to the Senator.

Mr. President, that was our first act. That the public were interested in this question, and that the public sentiment was in accord with the sentiment of Congress, I can show, I think, by reference to the platform of the Republican party in 1896. I will say, while I did not agree with all the provisions of that platform, this is one in which I heartily concurred, and it was unanimously passed by the committee on the platform, and unanimously adopted by the convention. That plank in the Republican platform reads:

CUBA.

From the hour of achieving their own independence the people of the United States have regarded with sympathy the struggles of other American peoples to free themselves from European domination. We watch with deep and abiding interest the heroic battle of the Cuban patriots against cruelty and oppression, and our best hopes go out for the full success of their determined contest for liberty. The Government of Spain, having lost control of Cuba, and being unable to protect the property or lives of resident American citizens, or to comply with its treaty obligations, we believe that the Government of the United States should actively use its influence and good offices to restore peace and give independence to the island.

The Democrats said in their platform:

CUBA.

We extend our sympathy to the people of Cuba in their heroic struggle for liberty and independence.

The Populists said:

We tender to the patriotic people of Cuba our deepest sympathy in their heroic struggle for political freedom and independence, and we believe the time has come when the United States, the great Republic of the world, should recognize that Cuba is and of right ought to be a free and independent State.

If there were any other political conventions that failed to in-dorse the independence of Cuba they have escaped my attention. I do not believe there was any sentiment anywhere against the expressions in these three platforms.

On the 29th of January, 1896, the Committee on Foreign Relations presented a resolution, out of which grew ultimately the one which I have read. There was a minority report made by several members of the committee, who agreed with everything that the majority did, except that they wanted to go further and recognize the Republic of Cuba.

On the 24th day of February, on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], the resolution presented by him on the 5th of February, which was for the recognition of Cuban independence, was, without objection, substituted for the resolution presented on the 29th of January. If any Senator has the curiosity to examine it, he will find that on page 2054 of the RECORD of that session. Senator White, of California, offered as a substitute another resolution, which was as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate contemplates with solicitude and profound regret the suffering and destruction accompanying the civil conflict now in progress in Cuba. While the United States have not interfered and will not, unless their vital interests so demand, interfere with existing colonies and dependencies of any European government on this hemisphere, nevertheless our people have never disguised and do not now conceal their sympathy for all those who struggle patriotically, as do the Cubans now in revolt, to exercise, maintain, and preserve the right of self-government. Nor can we ignore our exceptional and close relations to Cuba by reason of geographical proximity and our consequent grave interest in all questions affecting the control or well-being of that island. We trust that the executive department, to whose investigation and care our diplomatic relations have been committed, will, at as early a date as the facts will warrant, recognize the belligerency of those who are maintaining themselves in Cuba in armed opposition to Spain, and that the influence and offices of the United States may be prudently, peacefully, and effectively exerted to the end that Cuba may be enabled to establish a permanent government of her own choice.

That resolution was never voted on. On the 28th day of February, 1896, Senator J. Donald Cameron, of Pennsylvania, offered this resolution:

Resolved further, That the friendly offices of the United States should be offered by the President to the Spanish Government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

On February 28 the concurrent resolution was amended so as to include the provisions of Senator Cameron's resolution of that date, and as thus amended it passed the Senate by a vote of 64 yeas to 6 nays. I have at an earlier point in my remarks read the language of the resolution in the form in which it was finally passed.

Mr. President, during that session and up to the spring of 1897 this question was frequently before the Senate of the United States. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] introduced at various times several resolutions, which were not passed by the Senate; but on the 1st day of April, 1897, that Senator introduced the following resolution:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a condition of public war exists between the Government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time

maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba, and that the United States of America shall maintain a strict neutrality between the contending powers, according to each all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.

That resolution passed the Senate on May 20, 1897, by 41 yeas to 14 nays. I have gone carefully over all the debates, and I can find only one place in the debates from 1896 up to 1898 where anybody suggested the annexation of Cuba to the United States. I understand that is what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] mean when they say the Government was embarrassed because the reported resolution precluded annexation.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] said on March 3 that he favored the annexation of Cuba, but if that could not be accomplished to let Cuban independence speedily come.

On the 29th of March, 1898, Senator Allen introduced a joint resolution for the independence of Cuba. The Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] also introduced one. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] also introduced one. Every one of those resolutions directly or indirectly recognized a government in Cuba, and also recognized the fact that the Cubans were fighting for independence, and the resolutions approved it.

I do not think it is improper for me to say that the senior Senator from Ohio took a great deal of interest in this matter, and appeared before the Senate on several occasions urging that something should be done, and he always insisted that we should recognize the Republic of Cuba. I recall that he made some very able and very interesting remarks on that subject. He discussed the question in a statesmanlike manner, and he had the support in those views, I think, of a great majority of the Senate, as was shown by the subsequent action when we came to pass upon that question in the passage of the act. I have prepared and purposed to present some extracts not only from the Senator from Ohio but from other Senators. However, I shall not do so now.

I see the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] sitting in front of me—

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FORAKER. I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. I yield.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know what purpose the Senator has in view by making remarks of the character he is now making and citing the RECORD as he does, but I will say to him that he need not go to trouble to make out by statement the case he makes out against me, for I surely did do all that the Senator has said, so far as I was able.

Mr. TELLER. I hope the Senator does not misunderstand me. I did not mean to make any complaint against him or anybody else. I meant to establish the fact, which I want to do before I close, that the fourth resolution which I offered, and which was criticised by the Senator from Minnesota and by the Senator from Nevada, and has been frequently criticised in newspapers, even to the extent of saying that it was a Democratic snap taken on the Senate, that it was absolutely in accord with the sentiment on both sides of the Senate. When I refer to the Senator, I do not refer to him in the way of criticism, but by way of approbation, for he was very potent and influential in securing the final result.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment at this point?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I will say that the fourth resolution, which was offered by the Senator from Colorado, was, at the time when it was offered, accepted by the committee without any objection.

Mr. TELLER. I was going to come to that. The Senator from Ohio was a member of the committee.

On the 3d day of April, 1898, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be, and is hereby, instructed to report on or before the 5th instant a bill for the recognition of the independence of the republic of Cuba.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] said:

Let Spain know that no settlement will ever be satisfactory to us that does not give absolute independence to these people.

The Senator from Georgia also said:

If Spain would not accept our mediation, or in case she did, and failed to harken to the voice of reason and humanity and give these people absolute independence, then we would have exhausted all peaceable means to accomplish our policy. Then we should at once acknowledge the independence of Cuba. If Spain resisted it, we should drive her army and navy from Cuban soil.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the date?

Mr. TELLER. The 3d of April, 1898.

I want it distinctly understood that I am not reading these extracts to find fault with any Senator, for I do not know that any

Senator ever departed from it. I only read them as a justification of the fourth resolution, to show that it was not inconsistent with the sentiment of the Senate nor was it inconsistent with the sentiment of the country.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS] on the same day said:

Mr. President, I rose simply for the purpose of setting forth in this desultory and informal way the reason why I thought we ought to pass a resolution recognizing the independence of Cuba and declaring war against Spain. (P. 3501, second column.)

On April 5 Senator Chandler said:

The United States ought immediately to declare war against Spain and to maintain that war until the people of Cuba are made free from Spanish starvation and cruelty and the government of the island firmly established as an independent republic. (Pp. 3547-3548.)

Senator Turpie, on the 5th of April, said:

More than a year ago I addressed the Senate in favor of the recognition of the independence of the Cuban Republic.

The Senators who are here will recall that address. It was, as we would expect from the author of it, a very remarkable address, and met, I think, the approbation of the great majority of this body.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], referring to the platform of 1896, declared that it expressed the sentiment not only of the convention, but the sentiment of the country. In that I think he was nearer correct than he was the other day when he said that the resolution had been an embarrassment.

Senator Butler on the 11th of April offered a resolution which, among other things, contained this:

The Government of the United States hereby recognizes the Cuban Republic as a separate and independent nation.

And he said:

These resolutions express my feelings and sentiments, and I believe they express the feelings and sentiments of the American people. (P. 3703.)

On April 12, 1898, Senator Allen introduced a joint resolution requiring the President to take such steps as necessary to secure the immediate termination of hostilities in Cuba and an independent and stable government by the people thereof. (P. 3729.)

On the 13th of April the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested, if compatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate all diplomatic correspondence between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Kingdom of Spain respecting affairs in Cuba; and is also requested to inform the Senate whether or not this Government has ever submitted to the Government of Spain the proposition of Cuban independence, and if so, in what form such proposition was made, and under what conditions. (P. 3773.)

On the 13th day of April, 1898, Senator Davis, who was then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, offered the following resolution, with a report, which I will not stop to read:

Whereas the abhorrent conditions which have existed for more than three years in the island of Cuba, so near our own borders, have shocked the moral sense of the people of the United States, have been a disgrace to Christian civilization, culminating as they have in the destruction of a United States battle ship with 266 of its officers and crew while on a friendly visit in the harbor of Habana, and can no longer be endured, as has been set forth by the President of the United States in his message to Congress of April 11, 1898, upon which the action of Congress was invited: Therefore,

Resolved, etc., First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect. (P. 3773, with report.)

In the report the committee say:

The recognition of the independence of the people of Cuba is justified and demanded by the highest considerations of duty, right, and policy. (P. 3774.)

Also:

It is the opinion of your committee that the United States ought at once to recognize the independence of Cuba and ought to intervene. (P. 3774.)

The committee also state:

We have been assured by the same authority [Senators PROCTOR, GALLINGER, THURSTON, and MONEY] that the native Cubans, by superiority in education, are better qualified than the Spaniards, and are thoroughly capable to administer the government of the island. (P. 3774.)

The committee closed their report with the following:

First. That the people of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States to such an extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Senators Turpie, Mills, DANIEL, and FORAKER concurred in the report, but expressed the opinion that the United States should immediately recognize the Republic of Cuba.

On the 13th of April, speaking on the committee report, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] said:

If a people be free and independent, as we have in this first proposition declared that the people of the island of Cuba are, they, and they alone, have power to establish their government. Independence and sovereignty go hand in hand, and any people who have independence have the capacity and the right to exercise sovereignty, and it is a denial of independence to say in the next breath after you have declared it that we will undertake, or we do hereby reserve the right and power, to establish for that independent people a government such as in our judgment and opinion may be stable.

I mention these points of difference because it is absolutely essential to an intelligent discussion that we should know what are the issues which have been joined. Without knowing what are the questions of difference we are groping in the dark.

Mr. President, the question before the Senate was whether we would declare that the Republic of Cuba existed.

On the same day the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] said:

What kind of government can alone observe international obligations? Only an independent government, Mr. President. Therefore the President of the United States asks us to authorize him to use the Army and the Navy to stop the fighting in Cuba and establish an independent government in that island. (P. 3782, first column.)

Mr. President, not only was it the sentiment here, but the message which the President sent here, as claimed by the Senator from Massachusetts and not denied by anybody, was a declaration for the independence of Cuba and intervention on our part for its independence.

Senator Lindsay of Kentucky said:

The joint resolution declares that the people of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, a free and independent people, and to that extent I agree with the committee. (P. 3784, second column.)

He introduced a joint resolution, in part as follows:

That all such military operations should be carried on to the end that the independence of the Cuban Republic may be secured.

He recognized a government of some sort there.

Mr. President, there was some discussion at that time as to what might be our obligations if we recognized the Cuban government as a government. It was said by some Senators that the great debt Spain owed on account of Cuba, amounting to \$600,000,000, might be saddled upon the new government of Cuba if we recognized her as a successor to the Spanish Government.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] said:

I will not undertake to detain the Senate further than to say, with his leave, that I do not believe the President of the United States or any 10 men out of our 70,000,000 of population understand that the constraint which is spoken of is expected to be carried to the degree of assuming the government or control of that island.

There was some claim that one clause of the President's message might indicate that he proposed to put constraint both upon the Spaniards and upon the Cubans and to act as a mediator. I did not myself ever give that construction to it. I do not think that is what the President ever meant.

The Senator from Massachusetts continued:

We, as it seems to me, can no more be chargeable with the debts of Cuba or with the debts of Spain secured upon Cuba, if they are secured, than a fireman who puts out a fire in a house is liable for a mortgage on the house or a policeman who stops a row in a house and turns out an intruder is liable for the debts of the owner. (P. 3788, first column.)

On the 13th of April the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] offered a resolution directing the President to take steps to terminate hostilities in Cuba and to secure a stable and independent government for and by the people thereof.

On the same day Mr. ADAMS, in the House of Representatives, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported the following resolution:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized and directed to intervene at once to stop the war in Cuba, to the end and with the purpose of securing permanent peace and order there and establishing by the free action of the people thereof a stable and independent government of their own in the island of Cuba; and the President is hereby authorized and empowered to use the land and naval forces of the United States to execute the purpose of this resolution. (P. 3810, first column.)

The minority of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs reported another resolution, and section 1 was as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled—

SECTION 1. That the United States Government hereby recognizes the independence of the Republic of Cuba. (P. 3811.)

In it they urged the recognition of the Cuban republic. Without going to the RECORD, for I think I can state it accurately, on that proposition there were 150 yeas and 190 nays. It was not because the House did not believe that Cuba was to have a government of her own, but because some of the members of the House believed, as did some members of the Senate, that it might be embarrassing to us to recognize the government of Cuba and be compelled to conform our operations to its will and wishes. That was really the only complaint that was made, and the only reason, I may say, in my judgment, why we did not recognize that republic; and if any Senator thinks that I am mistaken about that I shall be very glad to hear what he has to say about it, because I regard it as an important point in this matter.

Mr. FORAKER. I remember that that point was insisted upon, but I never agreed that it was well taken.

Mr. TELLER. No. If the Senator from Ohio—

Mr. FORAKER. It always seemed to me to be an absurdity—

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Ohio made a very interesting speech against that theory.

Mr. FORAKER. It always seemed to me an utter absurdity that an intervening power must take orders from either of the powers between whom it intervened.

Mr. SPOONER. But if you recognize independence before you intervene you are intervening then to assist a government which you have declared independent.

Mr. FORAKER. It never occurred to me that that changed the legal aspect of the situation. It seemed to me we had the right to intervene if we saw fit. If we simply intervened between Spain and her own subjects in rebellion, that was one thing in a legal aspect, and if we first recognized the independence of the Cubans and then intervened, it was the ordinary case of intervening between two belligerents, both of whom had recognized governmental organizations; and I do not understand that an intervening power is ever expected to take orders from either of the belligerents. I never conceded that point. I know it is a debatable proposition, and it was debated. I only wanted to avoid, by sitting here in silence, the inference that I acquiesced in that theory.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from Colorado will allow me, I do not think anybody will ever accuse the Senator from Ohio of having acquiesced.

Mr. FORAKER. Well.

Mr. TELLER. No.

Mr. SPOONER. But that proposition was elaborately debated—

Mr. FORAKER. I know it was.

Mr. SPOONER. And some of us sincerely entertained the opinion—

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. That there was a very wide difference between intervening between a parent State and a revolting colony for the purpose of aiding it to secure its independence and an intervention which was preceded by recognition of independence. It was the opinion of the President, which is quite clearly stated, that to recognize first the independence of Cuba before intervention would place us in a position which when we did intervene, would be subordinate and extremely embarrassing. Of course the Senator from Ohio had his view, and the rest of us had ours, and we were equally in favor of the independence of Cuba.

Mr. FORAKER. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. Although—

Mr. FORAKER. I would not have thought it necessary to say anything if the Senator from Colorado had not called upon Senators to express themselves or otherwise forever hereafter to hold their peace, I suppose. I simply wanted to keep the record straight.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. FORAKER. If I may be allowed another word, it is one of those propositions about which there is plenty of room for legitimate difference of opinion and ground for argument. I took the view which I have stated, and the Senator from Wisconsin, with more success than I had, took the other view.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator from Ohio and I differed about it. I expect him always to think I am wrong and I know I shall always think he was wrong. But anyway we came out of it. But if my friend the Senator from Colorado will permit me a moment—

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. This proposition was stated in the debate, and abundantly sustained by authorities—writers upon international law—and although I may be mistaken, I have always supposed it had some influence with the Senator from Colorado in introducing what is called the fourth resolution, the wisdom of which I never have seen any reason to question, and that was this. I do not understand it was introduced as a pledge to the people of Cuba.

Mr. TELLER. No; it was not.

Mr. SPOONER. Because the people of Cuba demanded no pledge from the United States. They were in no position to demand a pledge from the United States. They had every reason to suppose that the people of the United States, intervening in the matter, did it with a high purpose to secure in the end the independence of the people of Cuba. But it is a principle of international law, well stated by Professor Lawrence, and important to all governments of the earth, most of which have colonies, that when a government intervenes by armed force between a parent state and a revolting colony, it must proceed upon the highest possible grounds and exclude all ulterior and selfish purposes. I so understood it, and on that theory I voted with great

pleasure for the resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado as wise, as statesmanlike, and from my point of view it was of infinite consequence. We declared to the world that in stepping between Spain and her revolting colony we had no purpose in the end to make of Cuba an American asset. It is important to a government which holds colonies that this principle of international law should be strictly observed, and I believe, if my friend the Senator from Colorado will pardon me just a moment longer, that the resolution introduced by the Senator from Colorado, and its adoption by the Senate, had more to do than all other things in preventing a combination against us among the nations which held colonies.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from Colorado permit me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I believe everybody in the Senate voted for the insertion of the resolution of the Senator from Colorado in the resolution which had been proposed by the committee. I believe the vote was unanimous.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to say to the Senator from Connecticut that the other day the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] stated that he dissented, but there was no roll call, and I supposed, as does the Senator from Connecticut, that everybody voted for it. It went nem. con., as it did when it got into the House.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I want to state what were my feeling and impression about it at the time. I felt that it was entirely unnecessary, and if I had any objection in my own mind to it at the time it was simply that it was unnecessary and perhaps indicated that there had been in the minds of some people an idea that we ourselves would acquire Cuba. That was the only objection I ever had to it, but I did not express that.

Mr. TELLER. On the 14th day of April—

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not know that it is important, but my recollection is that there was no vote by roll call taken in the Senate on this particular resolution.

Mr. TELLER. There was not.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There was no division?

Mr. FORAKER. No. The Senator from Colorado offered it, and the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Davis, having in charge the resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, announced that he accepted it. It was accepted, and it was voted upon with the other resolutions when we finally reached them.

Mr. TELLER. That is practically correct, although not quite.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There was no roll call.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I had the honor to address the Senate on this subject on the 15th day of April.

Mr. TELLER. That is the day I offered the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, sir. Upon that proposition I read from Lawrence, and it is well sustained, philosophical, logical, and reasonable in itself, this statement of the law of nations. May I read it?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. It is as follows:

In the opinion of some writers, interventions undertaken on the ground of humanity and interventions for the purpose of putting a stop to religious persecutions are also legal. But we can not venture to bring them within the ordinary rules of international law. It certainly does not lay down that cruelty on the part of a government renders it liable to be deprived of its freedom of action, nor does it impose upon States the obligation of preventing either ordinary barbarity on the part of their neighbors or that special kind of inhumanity which takes the form of religious persecution. At the same time it will not condemn—

That is, international law—

such interventions if they are undertaken with a single eye to the object in view and without ulterior considerations of self-interest and ambition. Should the cruelty be so long continued and so revolting—

As was this case—

that the best instincts of human nature are outraged by it, and should an opportunity arise for bringing it to an end and removing its cause without adding fuel to the flame of the contest, there is nothing in the law of nations which will condemn as a wrongdoer the state which steps forward and undertakes the necessary intervention. Each case must be judged on its own merits.

And so, to put the Government on high ground and the intervention which brought about the independence of Cuba upon grounds which would justify us before the world, the Senator from Colorado introduced a resolution declaring that we would not take Cuba to ourselves, but that our object was to put an end to outrage and savagery and cruelty there, establish a government, and leave that people to control its own destiny. That is what they have wrought out.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, on the 14th instant, the day before I introduced the resolution, I discussed that question of international law, and declared, as the Senator has shown now, that we could not, according to the law of nations, without discrediting ourselves before the world, take any profits or have any advantage out of that intervention. At that time the public press of Europe was filled with declarations that we were not going to intervene in the interest of humanity, but we were going to intervene because we were aggressive and avaricious, and that we meant to take the island and appropriate it to our own use.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. HALE. The Senator has been interrupted so much that I dislike to interrupt him further, but—

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HALE. What the Senator from Connecticut said a moment ago leads me now to make a statement. The Senator said he voted for the resolution, as nearly everybody did, and his only hesitation was that the situation was such that it seemed to be almost or quite superfluous to take any such attitude by a formal declaration of the Senate.

I do not quite agree with the Senator from Connecticut in that regard. I look upon it as a most providential thing in the course of this whole matter that the Senator from Colorado had the forethought, the prescience, to submit that resolution and attach it to the proceedings, and thereby make it for us a constraining force from that day to this. I believe that had it not been for that declaration always standing before us as an outright and express pledge and agreement Cuba to-day would not be a free Republic. Even with that declaration it is not until lately that I have been in my mind assured that we should speedily depart from Cuba and leave her to her own resources and to her own government.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and I had a colloquy on this subject a little more than a year ago, in which I expressed the gravest doubt about the result, and the fear that the lust for empire, acquisition, and subjugation would get the better of us, and that we should not leave Cuba. I remember very well that I held the Senator as squarely as I could to it, and he was very frank in reply to state his position upon the question; and he did state then and there that he believed, and had the right to believe, and no one else had the right to have skepticism to the contrary, that we would not let that declaration be proven a legislative lie.

Mr. SPOONER. I was right, was I not?

Mr. HALE. And the Senator was right. My declaration would not have helped, but the Senator's declaration, made squarely and explicitly, did have an immense effect upon events, and it was a warning that was taken to all those who had secretly and determinedly set themselves against our departing from Cuba. The Senator from Colorado, for initiating this most beneficent proposition, and the Senator from Wisconsin, with the attitude that he held at that time, almost equal with him, are more to be thanked than any others for our having first made this promise and then kept it.

I do not agree that there never was any danger to the contrary, and if we had put on another declaration that under no circumstances should the war result in subjugation and conquest and the acquiring of territory, everybody would have voted for it. Nobody had the wisdom to put it on.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. TELLER. I do not want to yield for a speech. If the Senator wishes to ask a question I will yield, but I wish to conclude to-night.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It was not necessary for the Senator to have said that at all. I had obtained the permission of the Senator from Maine to ask him a question.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator wishes to ask a question, I will yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will not take the Senator's time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will proceed.

Mr. TELLER. I was saying, when interrupted, that the press of all Europe was filled with denunciations of us and declarations that we were pretending to be moved by a spirit of humanity, but that we were really moved by a spirit of greed. I introduced the resolution without the slightest idea that there was any necessity to have any restraint upon ourselves. I never dreamed that there would arise in this country any number of people who would think of our taking the island in spite of the law that I, and subsequently the Senator from Wisconsin, laid down as binding. I see the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] before me. I remember that he took the same position we did. All were for

the independence of Cuba and nobody was for the annexation of the island or holding it in a Territorial condition or in subordination except as the resolution declared, until there had been a proper pacification of the island.

Now, Mr. President, it was a question for the Administration to determine when there was a proper pacification, and I did not share the fear of the Senator from Maine. I felt all the time, as the Senator from Wisconsin did, that under no circumstances was it possible for the American people, in the face of this well-known principle of international law, in the face of that declaration which went out to the world—and I believe it did have some influence upon foreign thought and foreign sentiment—ever to think of holding those people by annexation.

Mr. President, since those events there has been considerable discussion in the public press as to what our danger was at that time. I think the danger was perhaps greater than we anticipated then. I believe there was considerable danger of a combination of powers of the world against us in a way that probably would not have prevented our intervention, but it would have been exceedingly embarrassing to us at least.

I did not mean to say this—it comes in a little incidentally—but I will say that I am not one of those who believe very much in the friendship of nations. In all my reading I have never found a nation forgetting its interest. I have never found a nation anywhere that forgot its own interest and that did not put its interest ahead of that of anybody else. That is what every nation must do. You may talk about unity of blood and of language and of religion and all those things. They do not count in the struggle between nation and nation, and never have done so in the history of the world. We saw in our day and generation the people of the United States divided into two hostile camps. We have seen other people, speaking the same language, worshipping at the same altar, having the same traditions, going into a contest with each other when their interest demanded it.

I felt then that we were in some danger, but I believe we were in greater danger than I had ever supposed.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me just a moment?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. I wish to call the attention of the Senator to this. There can not be among nations any principle of international law more vital than that principle which is enunciated in his resolution. The nations of the earth which hold colonies, and which are confronted from time to time by insurrections, could not tolerate at all the doctrine that a separate independent nation could intervene between them and a revolting colony for purposes of annexation. It could not be tolerated at all. So I repeat I have looked upon the resolution of the Senator from Colorado as having prevented foreign concert against us in our Cuban intervention.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. BACON. With the permission of the Senator from Colorado, I think the narrative now being made by him—a résumé of what occurred at that important period—is not only very interesting, but very valuable, and I desire, with his permission, to make a slight contribution to a part of that history. I have reference particularly to the part of it which relates to the danger the United States were then in of becoming involved in war with European powers.

I have no definite knowledge, of course, as to how great that danger was, but the particular thing I desire to contribute in this connection is the fact which was within my personal knowledge, and I presume within the personal knowledge of a number of other Senators, that Mr. McKinley very gravely apprehended such a danger at that time. He was extremely reluctant to have us enter upon a war. At that period there was a greater disregard, of course, of that usual recognition of differences in party lines than at other times, and Mr. McKinley was in the habit of sending for Senators and Representatives for the purpose of conferring with them as to what the best course might be to be pursued.

On one day he sent for the then Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Faulkner, and myself, and we met him by appointment in what is known as the Cabinet room, where there was a very free interchange of views, more particularly an expression from him, of course, which lasted possibly for an hour. In that interview Mr. McKinley very strongly impressed us the apprehension which he felt that the European nations might become so alarmed at what they considered to be the aggressive policy of the United States, and regarding it as a move for the purpose of depriving Spain of one of her colonies, they might unite in a war against us. That view was very plainly expressed and repeated by him. I remember very distinctly what occurred as we left. When walking toward the front door of the room he walked with us, and as he

stood by the open door I shall never forget his last words, which I remember not only in substance, but in accurate verbiage, which were: "Remember, Senators, if this war breaks out it may be a world's war."

That was his expression made to us, and I thought possibly in connection with the statement and narration made by the Senator from Colorado this statement might not be without some value.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. CLAPP. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. TELLER. I yield.

Mr. CLAPP. These questions are not asked in any captions spirit, but they arise upon the merits of the Senator's discussion. I believe the Senator from Colorado opposed the so-called Platt amendment a year ago last March. Am I correct in that supposition?

Mr. TELLER. Yes.

Mr. CLAPP. Now, I will ask the Senator if one of the reasons for opposing that amendment was not the fact that in his opinion it would be inconsistent, we having passed the so-called Teller resolution?

Mr. TELLER. I gave as one of the reasons, perhaps, that it was inconsistent with the resolution.

Mr. CLAPP. I call it the Teller resolution; it is known as the Teller resolution. Now, I will ask the Senator if he is not satisfied that the present condition involving the Platt amendment and such recognition as was made of it is better than to have acknowledged the independence of Cuba without the restraint or restriction or relation involved in the so-called Platt amendment?

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, that has nothing to do with what I have been saying, and I do not intend to enter into a discussion of it at all.

On the 14th day of April, 1898, having discussed this question of international law, I also declared that I hoped somebody would offer a resolution of the general character I offered on the subsequent day. Nobody having offered it on the 15th of the month, I offered it. On the 14th day of April the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] said:

Mr. President, I am therefore prepared to support the resolutions of the House, if I have correctly interpreted them. I should like a little better the form which has been drawn up. I understand, by the honorable Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. It appeared in the papers, and I suppose I violate no propriety in saying that it appeared with his consent or his authority. I like that, which, I think, is a perfect expression of the limits and the extent to which it is necessary for us to go, and I think when we go that far, all other things will be added to us and all other things will be added by the inevitable and inexorable logic of events that are desired by the friends of freedom in Cuba (p. 3835, first column).

On the same date the then Senator from South Dakota, Mr. Pettigrew, offered a resolution, the first part of which is as follows:

First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent, and the Government of the United States hereby recognizes the Republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of the island (p. 3840, second column).

On the same day the then Senator from Delaware, Mr. Gray, said:

We can not guard against every human eventuality, but we can take care that a government formed under our supervision and care and tutelage shall be such a government as will be just not only to this country, but to those for whom we have concern on the score of humanity in the territory over which that government extends. I do not believe that there is any thought now or that there ever has been any thought that we are forever, after this matter shall be accomplished, to exercise a protectorate or suzerainty over that island or any government which may be set up there under our auspices (p. 3842, second column).

Again, he said:

I agree that the people of the island of Cuba of right ought to be free and independent. I wish to God that I could say that they are. I do not believe it (p. 3843, second column).

On the 14th of April the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS] said:

Sir, no one will distrust our motives in taking this step. We do not intervene for revenge, for the acquisition of territory, for the extension of our authority and power. Our past history is ample proof of this (p. 3846, first column).

On the same date House joint resolution No. 233, which subsequently became the law, was laid on the table, to be taken up on motion (p. 3847).

Senator Gray said, on the 15th:

If out of intervention on that account shall come, as it must come, the independence of the Cuban republic, then every American heart will rejoice and every American will applaud (p. 3888, first column).

Again he said, quoting from the President's message, wherein the President asked Congress to take steps to terminate hostilities:

That can mean nothing else than a government free and independent from the control of Spain or from the control of any other country whatever, and on that account I was willing to take the President's recommendation, etc. (p. 3888, second column).

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] on the same day called attention to the Senate resolution concerning Cuba in

1896 and the House resolution (p. 3889, first column). He also called attention to the joint resolution of the Senate of May 20, 1897, declaring, by a vote of 64 to 14, that a state of war existed between Spain and the government of Cuba.

On the same day the then junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. Wolcott] said:

All these things we must count in advance, and we have counted them. And when the day of the result shall come and Cuba is free, as we must make her free, we will have fought a country which can never indemnify us by land, for we want no land beyond our border; a country which can never indemnify us in money, for she has got no money. We must find our only satisfaction, and it must be the supreme satisfaction of a free people, in this, that we have poured out our blood and our treasures to relieve the cry of suffering humanity.

The war which is already upon us, whatever the phraseology of our resolutions, must be fought because it is the manifest destiny of this Republic to stand forever upon the Western Hemisphere a sentinel of liberty. It must come, because if we fail to listen to the voice of the suffering or the cry of the downtrodden upon this continent, we shall be untrue to those principles of liberty, humanity, and Christianity, upon which this country is founded as upon a rock (p. 3893, first column).

On the 16th of April I offered to amend the resolution of the committee by what has since been known as the fourth resolution of the joint resolution. In the second resolution of the committee I moved to add, "hereby disclaiming any disposition or intention to exercise jurisdiction or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and a determination when that is accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to the people thereof" (p. 3954.)

This is as the law now stands, except the word "sovereignty" is added before the word "jurisdiction" and the words "asserts its" are added before the words "a determination."

On the same day Senator Pasco said:

We can make no better beginning than by declaring at the outset that the republic is free and independent (p. 3960, second column).

On the same day the then Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Thurston, said:

When the Stars and Stripes go up on Cuban soil, I want our flag to share equally the free air of Cuba with another flag that bears a single star. Under the flags of two Republics, acknowledged before all the world, humanity and liberty will be safe and secure.

The RECORD of the Senate of April 16 shows that the committee resolution was, by a vote of yeas 51, nays 37, amended by adding:

And the Government of the United States hereby recognizes the Republic of Cuba as the true and lawful Government of that island.

After this vote was taken, Senator Davis of Minnesota, the chairman of the committee, offered the fourth resolution, which is in the exact language of the amendment I had given notice of, except, as I before stated, the word "sovereignty" was inserted before "jurisdiction," and the word "asserts," which I had omitted, was inserted to make the resolution read properly, otherwise the resolution of Senator Davis is exactly as I introduced it. That resolution of mine was made, as the Senator from Ohio has said, the action of the committee. I did not offer it, but I had given notice that I would offer it, and I introduced it and had it printed; but the Senator from Minnesota, then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, presented the resolution to the Senate, of course with my approval.

I had said to him that I thought its effect abroad would be better if the resolution came from the Committee on Foreign Relations than if it came from a single Senator; that I had no pride of authorship in the matter; that all I was desirous of doing was to secure results, and that if he would introduce the resolution as coming from the committee, in my judgment it would be very much better than for me or any other Senator to introduce it. He said, "I should like to insert the word 'sovereignty' before the word 'jurisdiction,'" and he did add the word "sovereignty," and I added the word "asserts" before the words "its determination," to make the resolution read properly; and it so passed.

Mr. ALLISON. Has the Senator examined the RECORD carefully as to the final disposition of that resolution?

Mr. TELLER. I have examined the RECORD carefully, and the RECORD shows that Senator Davis took up the matter. He did not say that he reported it in behalf of the committee, but I understood at the time that he had consulted the committee regarding it.

Mr. ALLISON. I am very glad to have the Senator say that, because otherwise I should have said the Senator from Colorado had in his place in the Senate offered the resolution, and the then Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Davis] stood in another part of the Chamber and said he accepted it. As, however, the Senator from Colorado has examined the RECORD, I will yield to him; but that would have been my testimony if I had been called on as a witness before hearing the Senator's statement.

Mr. TELLER. I could turn to it; but it is so late that it is hardly worth while to do so now.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not ask the Senator to turn to it. I have no desire to have him do so to-night. I understood the Senator from Colorado offered that resolution in open Senate.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator refer to the resolution known as the Teller resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I do.

Mr. TELLER. On the day we voted I find this in the RECORD:

So Mr. Turpie's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. I offer an amendment to the pending joint resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Davis] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the end of the joint resolution add the following paragraph:

"Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Davis].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRYE. I move to strike out in line first of the joint resolution the words "are, and;" so that, if amended, the paragraph would read:

"First. That the people of the island of Cuba of right ought to be free and independent," etc.

Mr. DAVIS. I move to lay the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] upon the table.

The yeas and nays being taken on the motion, the yeas were 55 and the nays 33; so that the amendment of the Senator from Maine was laid on the table.

Mr. ALLISON. I yield to the Senator. The RECORD seems to be in his favor, but I know perfectly well there was no debate upon the resolution at that time.

Mr. TELLER. No; but there had been some debate on it before then, though there was no debate when the vote was taken.

Mr. ALLISON. It was well understood in the Chamber by all of us that the resolution was really the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. TELLER. That is true.

Mr. ALLISON. And that it was agreed to when offered by the then Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Davis.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me one remark?

Mr. TELLER. I will.

Mr. CULLOM. I remember very well the whole story of the connection of the Senator from Colorado with this amendment and of the connection of the Committee on Foreign Relations with it. I have always thought and believed that that amendment, while it seemed at that time to be somewhat questionable, would do, as it has done, more to keep this country from insisting upon the annexation of the island of Cuba, and also to keep other nations from insisting that we had some selfish purpose in our course in reference to it, than anything else that could have been done, except the war itself.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I have but a few more words to say. We added to the House resolution a recognition of the Republic of Cuba. The House disagreed to the amendment; and when it came back to the Senate, the Senate adhered to its amendment by a vote of 42 to 35, which ultimately we receded from. There was some debate upon that, which it is not worth while, perhaps, now to insert.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will allow me, he will remember that all of us in the debate agreed to the declaration that Cuba of right ought to be free and independent, but many of us denied it to be a fact that Cuba was free and independent.

Mr. CULLOM. That is so.

Mr. TELLER. There was a motion to strike out the words "are, and;" so that the amendment would read:

That the people of the island of Cuba of right ought to be free and independent.

That was voted down. We insisted that the Cubans not only had a right to be, but they were, free and independent.

Mr. SPOONER. I recollect I claimed that if they were free and independent there would be no occasion for us going to war, but that they ought of right to be free and independent, and that we were going to war to make them free and independent.

Mr. TELLER. In that connection I want to call attention to what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] said, because I think it represents the views of those who wanted to recognize the independence of Cuba, as I did. In the debate on the 20th of April he said:

I felt in dealing with this question at this time we had a right to recognize that Government, and that it was our duty to recognize that Government. I think it was unfortunate that we did not recognize it, but it may not be as unfortunate as I imagined, for I think quickly, speedily, possibly even now, on the very day when the ultimatum has been sent to Spain pursuant to the resolutions that passed here, this Government has practically recognized the Republic of Cuba, and I think possibly it is true—we will all know it by to-morrow morning—that that Government is to-day being officially dealt with by the official representatives of this Government, as it should be (p. 4035, second column).

The Senator from Ohio also read a very interesting statement from a speech made by Senator Sherman as to the condition of the government in Cuba in 1896, which I shall not put in.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me once more, and I

will not interrupt him again? I want to read what President McKinley said in his message upon the question.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator may do that.

Mr. SPOONER. This is what President McKinley said:

To commit this country now to the recognition of any particular government in Cuba might subject us to embarrassing conditions of international obligation toward the organization so recognized. In case of intervention our conduct would be subject to the approval or disapproval of such government. We would be required to submit to its direction and to assume to it the mere relation of a friendly ally.

Mr. FORAKER. I do not want to too much interrupt the Senator from Colorado—

Mr. TELLER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FORAKER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has stated the views that he and other Senators contended for as expressed by the President in his message. There is one other feature of that message which I think it is due to history that attention should be called to in this connection, if this is to be a historical review of that time, as it seems to be.

The great point of difference between the President and some of the Senators, of whom I was one, was as to the character of our intervention. The President, as I understood him, favored neutral intervention, as contradistinguished from intervention in hostility to Spain, his idea being, as I understood from his message and as I understood from private interviews I had with him, that, if we intervened at all, it should only be to go down to Cuba and say to the belligerents: "Cease fighting, abide together in peace, and restore order;" and in support of that view I want to read a paragraph or two from the same message which the Senator from Wisconsin has read, if I will not too much interrupt the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. Go on.

Mr. FORAKER. Following immediately after where the Senator from Wisconsin left off, President McKinley said, in his message of April 11, 1898, as follows:

When it shall appear hereafter that there is within the island a government capable of performing the duties and discharging the functions of a separate nation, and having, as a matter of fact, the proper forms and attributes of nationality, such government can be promptly and readily recognized and the relations and interests of the United States with such nation adjusted.

There remain the alternative forms of intervention to end the war, either as an impartial neutral by imposing a rational compromise between the contestants, or as the active ally of the one party or the other.

As to the first, it is not to be forgotten that during the last few months the relation of the United States has virtually been one of friendly intervention in many ways, each not of itself conclusive, but all tending to the exertion of a potential influence toward an ultimate pacific result, just and honorable to all interests concerned. The spirit of all our acts hitherto has been an earnest, unselfish desire for peace and prosperity in Cuba, untarnished by differences between us and Spain, and unstained by the blood of American citizens.

The forcible intervention of the United States as a neutral to stop the war, according to the large dictates of humanity and following many historical precedents where neighboring States have interfered to check the hopeless sacrifices of life by internecine conflicts beyond their borders, is justifiable on rational grounds. It involves, however, hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest as well to enforce a truce as to guide the eventual settlement.

Mr. President, I understood the message of President McKinley at the time to mean that if we went into Cuba we were to go there for the purpose of exercising hostile restraint to whatever extent might be necessary against the Cubans as well as against the Spaniards. That is the reason I could not consent to that proposition, and that is a proposition I combat now. That I am not mistaken in that I want to show by just reading one extract from the annual message of the President of December 5, 1898, in which, reviewing the steps leading up to the war, which had in the meanwhile occurred and been concluded, the President said, speaking of this message of April 11, 1898:

I again reviewed the alternative courses of action which had been proposed, concluding that the only one consonant with international policy and compatible with our firm-set historical traditions was intervention as a neutral to stop the war and check the hopeless sacrifice of life, even though that resort involved "hostile constraint upon both the parties to the contest, as well to enforce a truce as to guide the eventual settlement."

Before the President made that recommendation, found as I have read it in his message of April 11, 1898, I had learned from personal interviews with him what his view was, and that, when coming to address Congress in that regard, he would so express himself. It was in anticipation of that, on the 29th day of March, 1898, after I had learned what we were to expect, that I introduced the resolution of that date, which I should like to put into the RECORD, if the Senator from Colorado does not feel that I am trespassing too far at this point.

Mr. TELLER. I have no objection to the Senator reading the resolutions.

Mr. FORAKER. The resolutions are as follows:

Be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

1. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

2. That the Government of the United States hereby recognizes the Republic of Cuba as the true and lawful government of that island.

3. That the war Spain is waging against Cuba is so destructive of the commercial and property interests of the United States, and so cruel, barbarous, and inhuman in its character as to make it the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States hereby does demand, that she at once withdraw her land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

4. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized, empowered, and directed to use, if necessary, the entire land and naval forces of the United States to carry these resolutions into effect.

In other words, Mr. President, in view of what I have said, it will now be perfectly plain to everybody that it was my purpose, in so far as I had any capacity to control events at that time, to so order events here in the Congress of the United States that instead of having a neutral intervention, so that the Cubans and the Spaniards were both to remain there, as suggested, the intervention of the United States should be an intervention in hostility to Spain and to drive her out. That drew the line and raised the question over which there has been so much controversy.

Mr. TELLER. I do not desire to detain the Senate longer, except to say that as to the fourth resolution, it was adopted here by practically a unanimous vote, and when it went to the House of Representatives it was unanimously adopted there. I understand that portion of the resolution never was in controversy, but the whole controversy between the House and the Senate was as to the recognition of the Cuban Republic.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I have not followed the Senator's discussion to-day all the way through. I have been detained from the Chamber until now. I wish to take this opportunity, by the courtesy of the Senator, to say that I thought when the Senate adopted the fourth resolution, which was drafted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] and presented by the late Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Davis, it was an eminently wise and timely measure.

Events have since confirmed my judgment as to its wisdom, and I think the American people will approve of it in the future. It was a declaration to all the world of the high motives that inspired the Government of the United States in entering upon a war with Spain to free Cuba. No matter what the future of Cuba may be, our record is above and beyond reproach. The Congress meant what it said, and we have kept the faith. We went to Cuba to free her people from Spanish misrule, not to seize the island. We declared war in the name of humanity and with no purpose of territorial aggrandizement nor with any ulterior designs. Our exalted purpose was frankly proclaimed, and to it we have steadfastly adhered.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, in my public life—and it has not been a very short one—I have never seen greater unanimity than was exhibited on the occasion of the passage of the resolutions to accomplish what the President had declared. Everybody felt that it was an important and a somewhat critical period. We knew we were going into a war. The feeling in the Senate was—of course I can not speak of the feeling in the other body, but I believe it was the same there—the feeling in the Senate was universal that we would stand by the Government in its efforts to carry out the provisions of those resolutions.

I want to read what I said at that time. After we had voted there was some question raised as to whether there was to be any partisanship in the matter. I disclaimed any desire to secure any partisan advantage out of anything in connection with the entire affair, and I disclaim it now, Mr. President. The then Senator from Maryland, Mr. Gorman, made a very patriotic speech, stating that it was his desire, and that he hoped it would be the desire of everybody here, to stand by the Administration, although we might not agree with everything that the Administration had done or might do.

I felt if war came I was not responsible for it. I had not done anything in my public relation to the Administration that could possibly be construed into impatience or pressure upon it.

I had waited with patience and with confidence that the Government in the examination as to who was responsible for the blowing up of the *Maine* would act justly and intelligently, and it ultimately did. I had said to the President of the United States that no act of mine and, so far as I could prevent it, no act of the party with which I was cooperating should embarrass him in any effort he wished to make to bring about a solution of that difficulty without war. I said to him that we would wait. When he said to me, "How long will you wait?" I said: "Mr. President, we will wait just so long as you say there is hope of bringing freedom to those people and relieving them of their distress by negotiations." We did wait until the President sent his message of the 11th of April, in which he said he had exhausted every effort.

Now, I will read what I said. This was the language I used:

Mr. President, I am going to do as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Gorman] said the other day he was going to do. I am going to forget that Wil-

liam McKinley was elected President on the Republican ticket. More than that, I am going to forget the methods by which he was elected; I am going to forget the class of men who stood back of him and by him; I am going to forget a hundred things that I have criticised; I am going to put them back of me, and I am going to stand up for every effort of his to maintain the integrity, honor, and dignity of the American people, and I believe every Senator on this floor has the same sentiments that I utter (p. 4069, second column).

That was true. If we have had controversies arising since, which we have, we had none then; and if we had been fortunate enough to escape a conflict of arms in the Asiatic sea we should have no controversy now. I disclaim for myself any desire to make any partisan profit or advantage out of that unfortunate condition in the Asiatic islands. I glory in the act of the Administration in finally putting in operation the Republic of Cuba. I think it is a great thing, and I think it is worth boasting of, if any nation is entitled to boast, that we have put back of us the cry of greed and avarice, which would have induced us to forget not only our obligations under international law, but our obligations under a solemn promise, not made, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, to Cuba, but made to all mankind—made as much to our own people as it was to Cuba and made as much to every nation on the face of the earth as it was to Cuba.

Mr. President, I have waited patiently, sometimes feeling that there was too much tardiness in this matter, and yet I believe I can say that I have never made public criticism of any kind touching the delay of the Government in regard to the matter. The final happy solution of our occupation and of our attempt to put those people in order for a government of their own I think I may say has justified the delay, and I have no complaint to make of it.

I prepared to make a speech on this subject immediately after the Platt amendment passed, because I was somewhat sensitive when I saw in the great public press that I was charged with having put in the resolution with the purpose of embarrassing the Administration and taking a snap on the Senate, and that it was an indication of my hostility to the Republican Administration. I looked up the speeches of Senators—every one of them—and was prepared to make a speech probably twice or three times as long as my speech to-day has been, when the present Presiding Officer [Mr. PLATT of Connecticut] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], on my saying to them that I was going to make it, said: "We fear if you make that speech it will embarrass the situation in the island of Cuba." I should have made a very different speech from that I have made to-day. I was somewhat sensitive over the criticism, and I should probably have said some things that might not have been wise and which I have no occasion to say now. When the Senators said that I said to them: "I have no desire to add any embarrassments. On the contrary, it is my anxiety not to do so, and I will refrain from saying anything about it until the conditions are such that I can do so."

I never could do it better than now, when the American flag has come down from Cuba, but, better still, a flag for Cuba has gone up. The American flag is the best flag in the world for Americans. It is not the best flag for men who do not want it. It is not the best flag for Cuba. Cuba's flag, not representing a hundredth part of the power or glory of ours, is the flag for Cuba, and when the Filipinos shall put up their flag and ours shall come down, as I believe it will some day, it will be a better flag to them than ours can be, although you may administer your Government with all the kindness and all the wisdom of which human beings are capable. The best flag is the flag that the men themselves put up. It is the only flag that ought to command the admiration and the love and the affection of the men who live under it, and it is the only flag that will. Liberty-loving men will never have any love for a flag that they do not create and that they do not defend.

During the course of Mr. TELLER's speech,

Mr. CULLOM said: Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent of the Senate that I be allowed, after the remarks of the Senator from Colorado shall have been concluded, to have inserted in the RECORD an article from the North American Review of April, 1901, written by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], giving a history of the whole Cuban affair from start to finish. I should like to have it inserted in the RECORD, so that it may be referred to hereafter.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator can insert it in the RECORD without any objection on my part.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well. I ask that the article may be printed in the RECORD after the remarks of the Senator from Colorado. It consists of some 14 or 15 pages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent for permission to print in the RECORD the article, referred to by him after the remarks of the Senator from Colorado. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the North American Review, April, 1901.]

CUBA AND CONGRESS.

[By ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE, United States Senator from Indiana.]

To appreciate the moderation and restraint of the Cuban legislation of Congress, it is necessary to consider the previously defined national policy of the United States respecting Cuba. To this national policy American statesmen of all political parties have given continuous expression. Jefferson led off in 1806 by deprecating the acquisition of Cuba by any other power than Spain. In 1809 he was discussing whether Napoleon would "consent to our receiving Cuba into our nation." The thought steadily grew with him until in 1823 he announced the settled conviction of the country, which every American statesman has followed. He said:

"I have ever looked on Cuba as the most interesting addition which could ever be made to our system of States. The control which, with Florida Point, this island would give us over the Gulf of Mexico and the countries and isthmus bordering on it would fill up the measure of our political well-being. Her addition to our confederacy is exactly what is wanting to advance our power as a nation to the point of its utmost interest."

Monroe suggested the ownership of Cuba as a military necessity. The acquisition of Cuba was the chief aim of Pierce's foreign policy. The main effort of Polk's Administration was to purchase this island. The movement was confined to no one political party. John Quincy Adams, in a formal letter, as Secretary of State, said, in 1823, of Cuba:

"Its commanding position with reference to the Gulf of Mexico and the West India seas, the character of its population, its situation midway between our southern coast and the island of Santo Domingo, its safe and capacious harbor of Habana, fronting a long line of our shores destitute of the same advantage, the nature of its products and of its wants, furnishing the supplies and needing the returns of a commerce immensely profitable and mutually beneficial—give it an importance in the sum of our national interests with which that of no other foreign territory can be compared and little inferior to that which binds the different members of this Union together. Such, indeed, are, between the interests of that island and of this country, the geographical, commercial, moral, and political relations formed by nature, gathering in the process of time and even now (1823) verging to maturity, that, looking forward to the probable course of events for the short period of half a century, it is scarcely possible to resist the conviction that the annexation of Cuba to our Federal Republic will be indispensable to the continuance and integrity of the Union itself."

Mr. Adams then showed that at that particular time we were not prepared for this event, but added:

"If an apple, severed by the tempest from its native tree, can not but fall to the ground, Cuba, forcibly disjoined from its own unnatural connection with Spain and incapable of self-support, can gravitate only toward the North American Union, which by the same law of nature can not cast her from its bosom."

Henry Clay, as Secretary of State, in 1825, nervously anxious as he then was, for political reasons, to state his views mildly, nevertheless said in a formal letter as Secretary of State:

"If the war should continue between Spain and the new republics, and those islands (Cuba and Porto Rico) should become the object and theater of it, their fortunes have such a connection with the prosperity of the United States that they could not be indifferent spectators; and the possible contingencies of such a protracted war might bring upon the Government of the United States duties and obligations the performance of which, however painful it should be, they might not be at liberty to decline."

Even Mr. Van Buren, that fox of American statesmanship, who never said anything that was not susceptible of different meanings, said as Secretary of State in 1829:

"The Government of the United States has always looked with the deepest interest upon the fate of those islands, but particularly upon Cuba. Its geographical position, which places it almost in sight of our southern shores, and, as it were, gives it command of the Gulf of Mexico and the West India seas, its safe and capacious harbors, its rich productions, the exchange of which for our surplus agricultural products and manufactures constitutes one of the most extensive and valuable branches of our foreign trade, render it of the utmost importance to the United States that no change should take place in its condition which might injuriously affect our political and commercial standing in that quarter."

In 1848 Buchanan in a formal letter, as Secretary of State, said:

"If Cuba were annexed to the United States we would not only be relieved from the apprehensions which we can never cease to feel for our own safety and the security of our commerce while it shall remain in its present condition, but human foresight can not anticipate the beneficial consequences which would result to every portion of our Union. This can never become a local question. With suitable fortification at the Tortugas, and in possession of the strongly fortified harbor of Habana as a naval station on the opposite coast of Cuba, we could command the outlet of the Gulf of Mexico, between the peninsula of Florida and that island. This would afford ample security both to the foreign and coasting trade of the Western and Southern States, which seek a market for their surplus productions through the ports of the Gulf. Under the Government of the United States Cuba would become the richest and most fertile island of the same extent throughout the world."

In 1859 the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate reported favorably a bill "to facilitate the acquisition of the island of Cuba," in which report the committee said:

"The ultimate acquisition of Cuba may be considered a fixed purpose of the United States; a purpose resulting from political and geographical necessities, which have been recognized by all parties and all administrations, and in regard to which the popular voice has been expressed with a unanimity unsurpassed on any question of national policy that has heretofore engaged the public mind. The purchase and annexation of Louisiana led, as a necessary corollary, to that of Florida, and both point with unerring certainty to the acquisition of Cuba."

And further on, in considering the question of constitutional power, the committee quoted the famous words of Thomas Jefferson:

"I am persuaded that no constitution was ever before so well calculated as ours for extensive empire and self-government."

The slavery question was at this juncture thrust into this national movement; but even that was not sufficient to make the minority of the committee, headed by Mr. Seward, protest against the acquisition of Cuba. That was the most remarkable circumstance in this whole discussion, for if anything could have induced Mr. Seward and the abolitionists to attack the proposition its advocacy by the slave power would have done it. But in expressing the views of the minority of the committee Mr. Seward merely reported a short bill as a substitute for the majority bill, directing the President—

"To communicate to the Senate the condition of the relations which shall then (next session) be subsisting between the United States and Spain, and of any negotiations that may then be pending for the cession of Cuba to the United States, together with such statements of the conditions of the Treasury, and also of the effective condition of the Army and Navy of the United

States, as may enable Congress to judge whether at that time it will be necessary to adopt any extraordinary measures to maintain the rights and promote the interests of the United States, connected with or growing out of their relations to Spain."

In the same year Judah P. Benjamin demonstrated that the United States must possess Cuba as a measure of safety. He said:

"Her harbors not only furnish points of rendezvous for hostile fleets, but secure harbors of refuge in which they could refit and repair, and prepare themselves for fresh attacks on our unprotected coasts. It was those harbors that afforded refuge for the British fleet after its descent on New Orleans; and in them did the French fleet refit after its bombardment of the castle of San Juan d'Ulloa. In the event of a rupture with Great Britain, this would be, in her possession, a tremendous point of vantage for attack. It is for these reasons that the instincts of the American people have already taught them that we shall ever be insecure against hostile attack until this important geographical and military position is placed under our protection and control."

Benjamin was a proslavery man, but Edward Everett was an antislavery man; and yet, as Secretary of State, in a formal letter in his official capacity, Everett said:

"Cuba lies at our doors. It commands the approaches to the Gulf of Mexico, which washes the shores of five of our States. It bars the entrance to that great river which drains all of the North American continent. Geographically and commercially Cuba would, in our hands, be an extremely valuable possession. Under certain contingencies it might be almost essential to our safety."

But he says that, for "domestic reasons (slavery)," the acquisition of Cuba "at the present time" (1852) was impracticable.

Stephen A. Douglas (Democrat) was earnestly for annexation in 1851, and Clayton (Whig) spoke of the future annexation of Cuba as a certainty. William L. Marcy believed that if he could secure the acquisition of Cuba while Secretary of State that single stroke would make him President. And the effort of the life of the "great Secretary" was directed to this end.

The tremendous internal questions following the civil war diverted the attention of the American people for almost a generation from their national policy of expansion, and for thirty years there was a dearth of expression upon the subject. But the instinctive purpose of the people asserted itself as soon as conditions within the present boundaries of the Republic had become normal. Accordingly, during the last ten years, expressions similar to the above, and directed to expansion generally, have begun to come again from men of weight and judgment, growing in volume and vigor up to the present hour. With these the public is so familiar that space can not be spared to quote them.

The fact back of these expressions and giving them meaning and vitality is that they were the voice of the American people. This whole historic movement has been the expression of the purpose of the people and not the plan of politicians. As early as 1730 the American colonists petitioned England to let them capture Cuba, which they called in their petition "that key to all America."

In 1782, when the English captured Habana, they did it with the aid of American troops; and the event caused great rejoicing throughout the American colonies, the greatest public demonstration of all being held by the people of Boston. During our Revolutionary war our ships and fleets found harbor and refuge in Cuba. From the beginning it has been with the greatest difficulty that our Presidents have held our impatient people in leash. Taylor and Fillmore issued proclamations forbidding American expeditions against Cuba. De Bow, in his Commercial Review, at the period of its greatest influence, declared that "public opinion is uniform and unanimous that the safety and security of the United States demand the annexation of Cuba." And yet De Bow himself was hostile to the proposition. He was merely recording a fact as an editorial observer. Democratic newspapers in the South and Whig newspapers in the North, agreeing on nothing else, agreed upon this. The Whig New York Times, in an editorial in 1852, criticised Fillmore for not acquiring Cuba, and the New York Tribune quoted the Times editorial on November 25, 1852. The State of Kentucky even went so far as to present to the Senate a formal petition praying for the acquisition of Cuba.

That the consummation of this national policy of the American people was inevitable has been the uniform opinion of political thinkers of foreign countries—even of Spain itself. Speaking of 1854, Rhodes, in his History of the United States, says: "The most sensible men of Spain were convinced that Cuba must sooner or later belong to the United States." In 1887, Froude, that keenest observer of all English historians, called America "the residuary legatee of all the West Indies."

Such was the current of American opinion and policy, and such was the view of the world, down to the moment when the Teller resolution was attached to the declaration of Congress demanding that Spain withdraw from Cuba. That resolution is as follows:

"That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

This resolution was reported to the Senate by the committee immediately before a vote was taken on the declaration to which it was attached, and was adopted as a part thereof without discussion.

If it means that the United States should utterly withdraw from Cuba, leaving that people, without aid, guidance, or restraint, to work their ruin and our injury, this resolution is destructive of the unanimous conclusion of American statesmanship and public opinion from before the foundation of our Government. It can not mean such withdrawal, therefore, since it is a rule of interpretation, familiar to courts, that no law must be construed as repealing all former laws on the same subject if it admits of a meaning in harmony with them. And it is not within rational belief that Congress intended such a sudden reversal of the unbroken line of expressions of American purpose on this subject.

If the Teller resolution means the unconditional abandonment of the Cuban people by the United States without having taken measures to secure a stable government, it was intended to prevent Cuban liberty and retard Cuban progress, for that such would be the result of such entire American desertion of Cuba I shall presently demonstrate. Such a meaning, therefore, can not be attributed to Congress, whose purpose in going to war with Spain was to aid and not to injure the Cuban people.

If this resolution means that we were to cast Cuba adrift, a derelict on our very coasts, it was intended to impair the interests, paralyze the Cuban commerce, and imperil the safety of the United States; for that such would be the result is known of all men. But a purpose so unpatriotic we dare not attribute to Congress, which, while inspired by an earnest friendship for every other people, owes its first and highest duty to the American people.

But if such be the meaning of this resolution, let us frankly admit that it was a mistake; and between the consummation of such a mistake with its ruinous consequences, on the one hand, and the frank and brave correction of it by the establishment and protection of liberty, order, right, and law, on the other hand, there is no choice. In individual morals and in national statesmanship the latter is the only course possible.

But does not a study of the whole subject give this resolution a different meaning? Must it not be read in the light of our entire history, of which it is a part? Must it not be interpreted by the geographical, industrial, social, and human conditions inherent in the situation? Such construction is natural, customary, essential. No act of American statesmanship stands alone. All that is enduring is the result of growth and outgrowth. Submitted to these usual and ordinary principles of interpretation, construed by these admitted standards of wisdom and justice, the Teller resolution does not deny, but demands, that the United States shall take measures to insure, on the one hand, the realities and not the mockery of liberty to the Cuban people and to insure, on the other hand, the welfare of the American people. Interpreted by these principles and measured by these standards, this resolution requires that the United States shall see to it that a stable Cuban government is established and maintained, and that the island is protected from all foreign interference or attack.

Is any other interpretation sane? Would not any court, construing the expression of the purpose of an individual, consider the whole case of which that expression is a part? And can this result in injury to Cuba? Who so concerned as the United States that Cuba shall have law, order, prosperity, and peace within and be secure from molestation from without? Who so interested as Cuba in the safety of the United States, upon whose markets, investments, and active friendship Cuba's welfare depends? The resolution can not be interpreted in hostility to the American people who made possible a Cuban government of any kind. And to construe it as requiring us to abandon the Cuban people to their fate is to do them irreparable wrong. Such construction would annul the resolution's very letter and defeat its expressed purpose. Considered even as an isolated statement, such construction is impossible; impossible, considered as a part of the unbroken current of American statesmanship; impossible, considered as a rule of procedure by which Congress was to solve the practical problem confronting it.

What was that problem? The facts define it.

Cuba was not able to expel Spain. Not all the Cuban people wanted Spain expelled. The United States ejected Spanish government from that island. In doing this, the United States expended many scores of millions of dollars. Our soldiers gladly gave their lives. And when the Spanish flag was hauled down and the American flag had taken its place, the Administration found property destroyed, roads few and poor, schoolhouses scanty and abandoned.

It found a postal service hardly superior to that of Spain a hundred years ago. It found an appalling illiteracy. It found cities without sanitation. It found poverty, starvation, demoralization, and all but anarchy. And yet these conditions were very little inferior to those which existed before the insurrection of the Cubans against Spanish authority. No more instructive study can be found than that of the sanitary situation reported in the American census of the island for 1899.

A separate article might be devoted to a statement of the vital statistics of Cuba. One or two facts may serve as a suggestive searchlight in passing. The population of the island is 1,572,797. Of this population, 1,108,709 are single, 246,387 are married, and 121,732 are living together by mutual consent. Of this population, 1,067,354 are whites and 505,443 are colored. Of the whites almost all are of Spanish descent.

Of these more than 1,000,000 whites, 50 per cent can neither read nor write; and of the more than half a million colored, more than 70 per cent can neither read nor write. This is the statement of our census, taken by Cuban collectors. A gentleman of unquestioned reliability, and of thorough personal familiarity with the Cuban people, informs me that at least 70 per cent of the whites and more than 90 per cent of the colored population can neither read nor write. And yet, under our military administration order has been restored and maintained, property and life protected, and sanitary revolution has been effected in Habana, Santiago, and the other considerable cities of the island. An excellent postal service has been established, and is now in operation in every province. Under the Spanish régime, at its best estate, scarcely 10,000 children were in school. At the time we took possession there were less than 4,000 children in school. The education was slothful, fragmentary, unscientific. To-day there are more than 150,000 Cuban children in school, and education is systematized and conducted on approved and modern principles.

And these items are only the landmarks of what has really been accomplished. All this, too, has been done by American authority in two years' time. It is a record of administrative capacity to which history shows no parallel. Of the remarkable achievements of the present Administration, not one is more brilliant than its conduct of affairs in the island of Cuba.

How best to preserve and continue this progress of Cuba; how, at the same time, to secure the safety and protect the interests of the United States; how to interpret the historic purpose of the American people, who had sacrificed so much treasure and blood for the Cuban people, and how to act so that the Teller resolution would not defeat itself and so that a steady government might exist in Cuba were the profound, complex, and most delicate questions which Congress was called upon to answer and which the Cuban Committee of the United States Senate, with ORVILLE H. PLATT, of Connecticut, at its head, answered so well in the Cuban amendment to the Army bill.

Let us consider this amendment:

That no foreign power shall establish any but trade relations with Cuba is necessary to both Cuba and the United States. It is intolerable that any foreign power shall obtain jurisdiction over an inch of Cuban soil. It is intolerable even to think of the government of Cuba giving to Germany or England or France or any other great power a naval station. And yet, without restriction, the Cuban government could give any foreign power rights amounting to that and keep within the Monroe doctrine. Think of the consequences! From Tortugas to Habana is only 90 miles, from Cuba to Yucatan is little more than 100 miles. A foreign squadron with naval rendezvous in Habana Harbor and a small patrol along the difficult Yucatan Passage could blockade the Gulf of Mexico, the Isthmian Canal, the Mississippi River, and absolutely cut off our immense foreign commerce from and to our Gulf and Mississippi River ports and our immeasurably greater coastwise trade much more completely than the same naval strength could blockade the harbor of New York. Accordingly, the Cuban amendment to the Army bill provides:

"That the government of Cuba shall never enter into any treaty or other compact with any foreign power or powers which will impair or tend to impair the independence of Cuba, nor in any manner authorize or permit any foreign power or powers to obtain by colonization or for military or naval purposes, or otherwise, lodgment in or control over any portion of said island."

But it is also necessary that the United States shall actually possess such naval stations along the Cuban coasts as may be necessary to our national defense and to the defense of Cuba. The Cuban people, numbering only a million and a half, unassisted by us, could not properly fortify or equip their harbors. Certainly they could not build a fleet necessary to the island's protection; and if they could, such a fleet, in certain contingencies apparent to all men, might be a menace to the American Government. But with the United States in possession of the necessary naval stations, the independence of the island and its people from every foreign power and every combination of foreign powers is assured, and the American Republic secured from attack in the Gulf, at the mouth of the Mississippi. Accordingly, the Cuban amendment to the Army bill provides:

"That to enable the United States to maintain the independence of Cuba and to protect the people thereof, as well as for its own defense, the govern-

ment of Cuba will sell or lease to the United States lands necessary for coaling or naval stations at certain specified points, to be agreed upon with the President of the United States."

Even this is not broad enough for the protection of the Cuban people and of American interests and safety. A familiar method by which a power secures practical control of a desirable point inhabited by a weak people is to seize that people's ports in order to collect the revenues for payment of debt.

The first necessity of a new government is money. Its earliest condition is financial obligation. Without restriction and guidance by a friendly and experienced government whose interests are the interests of the Cuban people it was inevitable that the new and experimental government of the island would contract debts beyond the ability of the Cuban people to pay. This has been the experience of nearly all new governments. If such a debt were contracted in England or Germany or France, it was inevitable that upon default of payment either of those powers would seize the revenues of the island to indemnify their citizens against loss. And the United States could not prevent this unless the United States would guarantee such debt or go to war with the creditor power to prevent its just collection. Every one of these contingencies is inconsistent with American safety and interests, and even more inconsistent with the interests, liberty, and independence of the Cuban people. Therefore the Cuban amendment to the Army bill provides:

"That said government (Cuba) shall not assume or contract any public debt to pay the interest upon which, and to make reasonable sinking-fund provision for the ultimate discharge of which, the ordinary revenues of the island, after defraying the current expenses of government, shall be inadequate."

It will be helpful to recall that the debt Spain contracted for Cuba was \$400,000,000; and this debt the Cuban amendment prevents Cuba from ever paying or being compelled to pay. The bonds issued by the revolutionary government in the insurrection preceding the last, and still held somewhere by some one, are supposed to reach into the hundreds of millions. The amount of bonds issued by the last insurrectionary government, held by persons in Cuba and the United States, is unknown; but I have heard it estimated at from \$100,000 to \$300,000,000. No accurate information can be had concerning the quantity of these bonds, or of the bonds of the former insurrectionary government. What part, if any, they play at present can only be surmised. It is doubtful if they affect the question; but they are useful as indicating the financial certainties of an unrestrained Cuban Government.

Even with all the above, the welfare of the Cuban people was still open to attack from another enemy and at their weakest point. That point was within, and that enemy themselves. The right of the United States to intervene for the maintenance of the realities of Cuban freedom is the measure of all measures most in the interests of the Cuban people. Would it have been wise and just to neglect this most important and immediate obligation of all? If it is our business to see that the Cubans are not destroyed by any foreign power, is it not our duty to see that they are not destroyed by themselves? It was a far-seeing benevolence which inspired Congress to provide that we may preserve the Cuban Government from the hands of warring factions, and protect the individual liberty, the property, and the rights of Cuban citizens. Congress actually bestowed upon Cuba the same guaranty of social order and governmental stability which our Constitution guarantees to every one of the States of the Union. This great provision of the Cuban amendment is as follows:

"That the Government of Cuba consents that the United States may exercise the right to intervene for the preservation of Cuban independence, the maintenance of a Government adequate for the protection of life, property, and individual liberty, and for discharging the obligations with respect to Cuba imposed by the treaty of Paris on the United States, now to be assumed and undertaken by the Government of Cuba."

The sanitation of Cuba was the pressing problem which confronted the Administration upon our occupation of the island, and it is the immediate question which will confront the island's new government. In this vital business even the best-equipped Cubans are unschooled. And yet, upon proper sanitation depends the security of the Cuban people from pestilence. Upon it depends the safety of our own people from yellow fever. New Orleans, Mobile, Tampa, all our Southern ports, have time and again been infected, and the disease has spread northward even to the Ohio. It is a subject which admitted and admits of no trifling. It is a business to be dealt with practically and on the instant. To enthrone a plague in a permanent home at the very gates of the Republic would have been an act which a volume of resolutions, no matter how interpreted, never could have excused. And Congress never wrought more wisely than when it provided in the Cuban amendment:

"That the Government of Cuba will execute, and as far as necessary extend, the plans already devised, or other plans to be mutually agreed upon, for the sanitation of the cities of the island, to the end that a recurrence of epidemic and infectious diseases may be prevented, thereby assuring protection to the people and commerce of Cuba, as well as to the commerce of the Southern ports of the United States and the people residing therein."

That the sinister situations, which the Cuban amendment are designed to prevent, would have been the results of a Cuban Government unaided by the United States, is not an open question. Were no examples at hand, the character and history of the Cuban population itself proves this. But examples are at hand, and the men to whom the American people have entrusted their interests, and those of the Cuban people also, had to consider them.

These examples are the Central and South American Republics. Review them, taking the most advantageously situated first.

The Argentine Republic has the best climate, the most fertile soil, and the richest resources of any portion of South America, and, with perhaps two exceptions, of the entire surface of the earth. It has a larger percentage of solid, self-governing people of Europe than any other South American State. But its history bristles with revolt. There have been two revolutions within the last ten years. The killing and wounding of two or three thousand people in a political riot has occurred more than once. Schemes of financial idealists have been put into reckless practice. And yet the paper constitution of this Republic is admirable, its schools numerous, and its system of education, in theory, excellent.

To the north of the Argentine Republic lies Brazil. It became a republic in 1889 by bloodless revolution. In one year another revolution placed Peixoto in the President's chair, and in less than two years more another revolution, with the army supporting one side and the navy the other, continued until Admiral Benham, in command of the war ships of the United States, threatened to fire on the insurgent navy in the harbor of Rio de Janeiro, thus ending the revolt. To the north of Brazil is Venezuela. From 1821, when independence was established, until 1870 Venezuela was in a state of almost continuous convulsion. And although peace has been more assured since that time conditions have been anything but settled.

Of Colombia, from which Venezuela seceded after Bolívar had wrested independence from Spain, Hamblen Sears declares: "Its history to the present day has been one of the sudden rise of one or another of the popular leaders and his sudden fall." This, too, is largely true of Costa Rica, although the government of that State has been and is more stable than that of most Spanish-American republics.

Guatemala has been the red field of revolution and the hotbed of impracticable dreams. Of Honduras, Mr. Sears declares that, "like the other Central American republics, Honduras has been full of bloodshed and internal war." And he says that "Nicaragua, since 1860, has been most of the time in a state of war, interrupted with a change of Presidents and numerous pronunciamientos." The history of Peru is the narrative of the rise and fall of dictators. Those who think that the ability of the Cuban people to frame a paper constitution with rapidity is an evidence of capacity for self-government should remember that Peru surpasses Cuba as a rapid constitution maker, having produced three separate constitutions in little more than ten years—one in 1823, one in 1833, and still another in 1839. And Mr. Sears despairingly writes: "The Salvadorian constitution has been so often changed that it is impossible to follow it." Until recent years Chile has been in a state of recurrent revolution and violence.

The condition of public order was illustrated by the attack upon the peaceful seamen of the American ship *Baltimore*, still fresh in the memory of all. Not a single Spanish-American republic brightens this melancholy chronicle. Paraguay has been the scene of so much strife that its male population was at one time almost extinct. And Uruguay has been called the "Battlefield of the La Plata." All these countries show a languid progress toward settled conduct and self-restraint; but every forward step has been made at terrible cost, a cost which the aid and instruction of a friendly and experienced government might have saved to each while accelerating that progress incalculably.

It must be repeated and again repeated that the paper constitutions of these countries have been fine examples of government by manuscript. This clarifying fact must not be forgotten by those who think that government by manuscript is equivalent to government by practice.

These political phenomena, common to all Spanish-American republics, whether in the tropic, semitropic, or temperate zone, unvaried by climate or character of soil, and occurring in spite of excellent paper constitutions, are object lessons which Congress dared not disregard. The character of the people of these republics is similar to that of the people of Cuba. Their racial origin is the same. Their history has been the same. Their tutelage under Spanish misrule has been the same. If there is any element of difference, that element is the greater proportion of blacks in Cuba. But history and contemporaneous fact do not justify the belief that this element, left to itself, increases the Cuban capacity for self-government, unaided, unguided, and unrestrained.

Haiti, directly across from Cuba, is an instance. When under the rule of the French all writers agree that, in spite of the drawback of slavery, Haiti was a prosperous colony. But from the time French power was overthrown its condition has been serious. A late writer says that "the atrocious administration of the Government all through the Haitian history of this century has been unequaled in the world." On the contrary, British Guiana and British Honduras, with government administered by those who have a capacity for administration, have enjoyed a steadiness of order and a respect for law unequaled elsewhere in South or Central America; and New Mexico, with a population racially similar to those of Spanish America, has, under our administration, given us no trouble.

In dealing with Cuba, Congress could not ignore all this. Congress was compelled to consider the character and inexperience of Cuba's population; the history of the attempts of similar populations to govern themselves; the present condition of such experimental governments on the one hand, and the situation of the same populations, guided and restrained by the protection of an administrative people, on the other hand. Congress had to consider, too, the facts of the last two years—the expulsion of Spain from Cuba by American arms; the occupation of the island by American authority, law, and order; the feeding of starving Cuban thousands with American bread; the establishment of Cuban schools, posts, and sanitation upon modern methods by American administrators; the American purification of the Cuban customs service; the impartial American administration of Cuban justice; the protection of Cuban life and property by an American and Americanized police; the beginning of the development of the richest agricultural, mineral, and timber resources on the face of the globe, under the faith of American protection; in a word, the American foundation in Cuba of civilization and of that liberty regulated by law which is the end and purpose of all free government.

Congress had to consider, too, the American people. The sacrifices of the American people in blood and treasure and administration deserved such consideration. The geographical position of Cuba demanded it. The historian of a century hence would have properly denounced any action on the part of the American Congress which, by any possibility, might result in delivering this gateway to the American Mediterranean, to any and all isthmian canals, to the mouth of that great artery of American commerce, the Mississippi River, to our whole Gulf seaboard of 3,561 miles, over into the hands of those who, by treaty or purchase or any circumstances of peace or war, might possibly become our national foes.

Thus it appears that our Cuban legislation deprives Cuba of nothing that can help her, but bestows every benefit and erects every safeguard necessary to her settled and orderly self-government. It insures the development of the island's resources and the highest happiness possible to its people. Against the enemies of Cuba, foreign and domestic, is drawn the sword of the great Republic; and under its protection the infant state may grow in peace and wax strong in a sure security. It is an inspiring scene with which the young century begins—the newest government of the world aided, guided, and protected by the freest.

We are not depriving Cuba of liberty; we are helping her to liberty. Landowners are not to be robbed; they are to be protected. Cities are not to be sacked; they are to be defended. Equal rights are not to be violated; they are to be preserved and enforced. Free speech is not to be suppressed; it is to be fostered. Education is not to be destroyed; it is to be built up. But anarchy is to be kept down, foreign powers kept at bay, and the elements that oppose Cuban progress held in check. All this is not the denial of liberty; it is the bestowal of liberty; for liberty can not live without order and law.

The Cuban people and the American people are not and are not to be enemies or strangers. We are and are still more to be friends, "close friends," to use the President's felicitous phrase. We are not yet united into a single nation as the fathers hoped we should be; and such a union may never occur; but, while establishing Cuba's independent governmental identity, the United States has given her our permanent counsel, aid, and comfort.

Whether that relation shall develop into a still closer connection depends upon the Cuban people. It is a question which time alone can adequately answer. No wisdom equals the wisdom of events. And the Cuban legislation of Congress permits the wisdom of events to work out its results in its own time. Meanwhile, the relation established by that legislation is admirable, considered from the view point of the present; and it may prove the permanent solution of this hitherto vexed and vexing problem. But whether this is the final development, or whether it is an epoch in an historical evolution, growing ever happier as it proceeds, the welfare of the Cuban people and the safety of the American people are secure.

ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE.

ABANDONED MILITARY RESERVATIONS IN WYOMING.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Illinois withhold the motion until I can call up a bill which is on the Presiding Officer's desk? Mr. CULLOM. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the action of the House on Senate bill 3908.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3908) granting homesteaders on the abandoned Fort Bridger, Fort Sanders, and Fort Laramie military reservations, in Wyoming, the right to purchase one quarter section of public land on said reservations as pasture or grazing lands, which were, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "exercised" and insert "or may hereafter exercise;" on page 1, line 6, before "in," to insert "or the abandoned Fort Laramie Wood Reservation, to which the homestead laws are hereby extended;" on page 1, line 6, to strike out "now;" on page 1, line 8, after "is," to insert "a resident and;" and to amend the title so as to read:

A bill granting homesteaders on the abandoned Fort Bridger, Fort Sanders, and Fort Laramie military reservations, and Fort Laramie Wood Reservation, in Wyoming, the right to purchase one quarter section of public land on said reservations as pasture or grazing land, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming to explain the amendments.

Mr. WARREN. The main amendment includes the Fort Laramie wood reservation with the other reservations mentioned. That is the only amendment, except a change of language.

Mr. SPOONER. Is the inclusion of this reservation recommended by the Interior Department?

Mr. WARREN. I so understand from the House. If there is any question about it I will withdraw the motion to concur.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know anything about it. The Senator from Iowa may.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not. That is the reason why I inquired of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the matter may go over.

Mr. WARREN. I do not object to that. It is a matter which relates to Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the vote will be reconsidered, and the question will be regarded as open.

Mr. WARREN subsequently said: The objection to the concurrence in the House amendments to Senate bill 3908 has been withdrawn, and I therefore move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CULLOM. I will withdraw the motion for an executive session if the Senator from Wyoming is certain he will get the bill through.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair again lays before the Senate the bill referred to. The question is on concurring in the amendments of the House of Representatives.

The amendments were concurred in.

CATHARINE F. EDMUNDS.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1172) granting an increase of pension to Catharine F. Edmunds, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

J. H. GALLINGER,
J. R. BURTON,
PARIS GIBSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
H. C. LOUDENSLAGER,
J. H. BROMWELL,
WILLIAM RICHARDSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 23, 1902, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 22, 1902.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Asst. Surg. Holton C. Curl, to be a passed assistant surgeon in the Navy, from the 14th day of October, 1901, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade.

Lieut. Walter J. Sears, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy, from the 17th day of December, 1901, vice Lieut. Commander Robert I. Reid, retired.

Lieut. John A. Bell, to be a lieutenant-commander in the Navy,

from the 15th day of January, 1902, vice Lieut. Commander Carlos G. Calkins, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Edward F. Qualtrough, to be a commander in the Navy, from the 9th day of February, 1902, vice Commander Henry B. Mansfield, promoted.

Pay Inspector Ichabod G. Hobbs, to be a pay director in the Navy, from the 28th day of April, 1902, vice Pay Director Edward Bellows, retired.

POSTMASTERS.

John T. Lindley, to be postmaster at Ontario, in the county of San Bernardino and State of California, in place of John T. Lindley. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Benjamin J. Maltby, to be postmaster at Northford, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut, in place of Benjamin J. Maltby. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

William E. Stouffer, to be postmaster at Breckenridge, in the county of Summit and State of Colorado, in place of Maude E. McLean. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

George S. Avery, to be postmaster at Galena, in the county of Jo Daviess and State of Illinois, in place of George S. Avery. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

William H. Whitehouse, to be postmaster at Mount Olive, in the county of Macoupin and State of Illinois, in place of Philip Rodenberg. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1902.

Frank Rockwell, to be postmaster at St. Charles, in the county of Kane and State of Illinois, in place of Frank Rockwell. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

Joseph S. Morgan, to be postmaster at Dubuque, in the county of Dubuque and State of Iowa, in place of Joseph S. Morgan. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Harry E. King, to be postmaster at Maquoketa, in the county of Jackson and State of Iowa, in place of Harry E. King. Incumbent's commission expired May 20, 1902.

Benjamin A. Nichols, to be postmaster at West Liberty, in the county of Muscatine and State of Iowa, in place of Benjamin A. Nichols. Incumbent's commission expires May 28, 1902.

Joel P. Deboe, to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Hickman and State of Kentucky, in place of James A. Deboe. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1902.

Joseph W. Gary, to be postmaster at Caribou, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine, in place of Joseph W. Gary. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1902.

Thomas G. Herbert, to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Sagadahoc and State of Maine, in place of Thomas G. Herbert. Incumbent's commission expires May 24, 1902.

William H. Foote, to be postmaster at Westfield, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts, in place of William H. Foote. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Charles McKerlie, to be postmaster at Sturgis, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Michigan, in place of Erastus T. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

James H. Williams, to be postmaster at Whitehall, in the county of Muskegon and State of Michigan, in place of James H. Williams. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1902.

Frank B. Lamson, to be postmaster at Buffalo, in the county of Wright and State of Minnesota, in place of Frank B. Lamson. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1902.

Charles E. Callaghan, to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Olmsted and State of Minnesota, in place of Charles E. Callaghan. Incumbent's commission expired March 4, 1902.

Fred A. Swartwood, to be postmaster at Waseca, in the county of Waseca and State of Minnesota, in place of Fred A. Swartwood. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1902.

Ira L. Kirk, to be postmaster at Bozeman, in the county of Galatin and State of Montana, in place of William B. Burket. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1902.

E. D. Turner, to be postmaster at Delamar, in the county of Lincoln and State of Nevada, in place of Alexander I. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1902.

Abram W. Boss, to be postmaster at Flemington, in the county of Hunterdon and State of New Jersey, in place of Abram W. Boss. Incumbent's commission expires May 24, 1902.

Edward W. Martin, to be postmaster at Hoboken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in place of Leonard Schroeder. Incumbent's commission expires May 28, 1902.

William O. Armbruster, to be postmaster at Weehawken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in place of William O. Armbruster. Incumbent's commission expires July 7, 1902.

Charles Eichhorn, to be postmaster at West Hoboken, in the county of Hudson and State of New Jersey, in place of Charles Eichhorn. Incumbent's commission expires July 1, 1902.

Marcus L. Wood, to be postmaster at Frankfort, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York, in place of Marcus L. Wood. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1902.

George T. Salmon, to be postmaster at Lima, in the county of

Livingston and State of New York, in place of George T. Salmon. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

Amanda E. Morris, to be postmaster at Hendersonville, in the county of Henderson and State of North Carolina, in place of Amanda E. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1902.

Thomas N. Tarbox, to be postmaster at Cedarville, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio, in place of Thomas N. Tarbox. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1902.

Henry Thomas, to be postmaster at Cuyahoga Falls, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio, in place of Henry Thomas. Incumbent's commission expired May 5, 1902.

John P. Barden, to be postmaster at Painesville, in the county of Lake and State of Ohio, in place of John P. Barden. Incumbent's commission expired February 25, 1902.

John W. Morris, to be postmaster at Piqua, in the county of Miami and State of Ohio, in place of John W. Morris. Incumbent's commission expired May 16, 1902.

Thomas L. Flattery, to be postmaster at Wooster, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio, in place of Thomas L. Flattery. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1902.

William W. Henderson, to be postmaster at Brookville, in the county of Jefferson and State of Pennsylvania, in place of William W. Henderson. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

David W. Morgan, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Venango and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Elisha W. Smith. Incumbent's commission expired April 25, 1902.

Charles A. Dunlap, to be postmaster at Manheim, in the county of Lancaster and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Christian J. Reiff. Incumbent's commission expired January 14, 1902.

James Ewart, to be postmaster at Colfax, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington, in place of James Ewart. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

Lewis S. Patrick, to be postmaster at Marinette, in the county of Marinette and State of Wisconsin, in place of Lewis S. Patrick. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1902.

John P. Bennett, to be postmaster at Yazoo City, in the county of Yazoo and State of Mississippi, in place of James E. Everett, removed.

Alexander Y. Jones, to be postmaster at Renovo, in the county of Clinton and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Robert N. Roberts, deceased.

Allen H. Webster, to be postmaster at Cuba, in the county of Fulton and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential April 1, 1902.

George E. Sapp, to be postmaster at Pecos, in the county of Reeves and State of Texas. Office became Presidential January 1, 1902.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 1902.

SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

John Gardner Coolidge, of Massachusetts, to be secretary of the legation of the United States at Peking, China.

SECOND SECRETARY OF LEGATION.

Henry P. Fletcher, of Pennsylvania, to be second secretary of the legation of the United States at Habana, Cuba.

POSTMASTERS.

J. W. Stauffer, to be postmaster at Pittsfield, in the county of Pike and State of Illinois.

Adele E. Barnes, to be postmaster at Delavan, in the county of Walworth and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, May 22, 1902.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The following prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.:

Our Father, who art in heaven, we thank Thee for that inherent love of liberty which from time immemorial has inspired men to deeds of heroism and glory, and which gave to our fathers the spirit of 1776, which added a new nation to the world, a government of the people, by the people, for the people, and that under its benign influence and guiding hand a new republic has just been born in the Western Hemisphere. God grant that the people of Cuba may appreciate the right to think for themselves, to act for themselves, and enjoy the fruit of their own labors; that they may use, but never abuse, those precious privileges; that they may grow intellectually, morally, and spiritually, and become an added instrument in Thy hands for the spread of Thy Kingdom upon the earth. In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

THOMAS WELLS.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Speaker, since the passage of House bill 12576, to increase the pension of Thomas Wells, the beneficiary has died. Therefore there seems to be no necessity for this bill going to the President, and I offer the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the House has been informed that since the passage of the bill (H. R. 12576) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Wells the said Thomas Wells has died: Therefore,

Resolved, That the said bill (H. R. 12576) be transmitted to the Senate with the request that it reconsider the vote whereby it passed the said bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken and the resolution was agreed to.

USE AND IMPROVEMENT OF GOVERNORS ISLAND, BOSTON HARBOR.

The SPEAKER laid before the House House joint resolution 113, authorizing the use and improvement of Governors Island, Boston Harbor, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. CONRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

WILLIAM D. TANNER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 6360) granting an increase of pension to William D. Tanner, with a Senate amendment, which was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MATILDA E. CLARKE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 12418) granting a pension to Matilda E. Clarke, with Senate amendments, which were read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

CATHERINE F. EDMUNDS.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report, and I ask that the reading of the report be dispensed with and that the statement be read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the report and that the statement be read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The report of the committee of conference is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1172) "An act granting an increase of pension to Catherine F. Edmunds," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments.

H. C. LOUDENSLAGER,
J. H. BROMWELL,
WILLIAM RICHARDSON,
Managers on the part of the House.
J. H. GALLINGER,
J. R. BURTON,
PARIS GIBSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the conferees was read, as follows:

This bill originally passed the Senate at \$35 per month, but was amended in the House to \$30 per month. The result of the conference is that the House recedes from its amendment, and your conferees recommend that the bill pass at \$25 a month, as it originally passed the Senate.

H. C. LOUDENSLAGER,
J. H. BROMWELL,
WILLIAM RICHARDSON.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the immigration bill; and, pending that motion, I desire to state that I have agreed with my colleague on the other side that general debate should cease at this time. I now ask unanimous consent to confirm our agreement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12199, being the immigration bill; and pending that motion asks unanimous consent that general debate be now closed. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question now is on the motion of the

gentleman to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BOUTELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12199. General debate having been closed, the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill by paragraphs.

The Clerk read as follows:

That there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of \$1.50 cents for each and every passenger not a citizen of the United States, or of the Dominion of Canada, or of the Republic of Mexico, who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port to any port within the United States. The said duty shall be paid to the collector of customs of the port or customs district to which said alien passenger shall come, or, if there be no collector at such port or district, then to the collector nearest thereto, by the master, agent, owner, or consignee of every such vessel, or by the alien passenger, if such alien passenger comes overland, within twenty-four hours after the arrival of such vessel in port, or by such overland alien passenger upon application for admission.

The money thus collected shall be paid into the United States Treasury and shall constitute a permanent appropriation to be called the "immigrant fund," to be used under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury to defray the expense of regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States under this act, including the cost of reports of decisions of the Federal courts, and digests thereof, for the use of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, and the salaries and expenses of all officers, clerks, and employees appointed for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of this act. The duty imposed by this section shall be a lien upon the vessel which shall bring such aliens to ports of the United States, and shall be a debt in favor of the United States against the owner or owners of such vessels, and the payment of such duty may be enforced by any legal or equitable remedy; and if any such alien seeking admission overland refuses or neglects to pay such duty as hereinbefore provided he shall be refused admission to the United States, and if found subsequently to have obtained admission thereto after such neglect or refusal, he shall be deemed and adjudged to be unlawfully therein and may be deported, as is provided hereinafter for the deportation of other aliens found unlawfully in the United States: *Provided*, That the Commissioner-General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, by agreement with foreign transportation lines, as provided in section 33 of this act, may arrange in some other manner for the payment of the duty imposed by this section upon aliens seeking admission overland, either as to all or as to any such aliens.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

In line 25, page 2, after the word "immigration," insert the words "under the direction of."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PAYNE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13895) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 593) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of the Northern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 43.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Committee on Enrolled Bills, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 533) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a national sanitarium of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota, are hereby authorized to strike out the words "Branch Home" from line 12, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the word "sanitarium."

IMMIGRATION.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SHATTUC. I send up the amendments of the committee. Mr. POWERS of Maine. I desire to be recognized after it is offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee amendment has already been read by the Clerk, but without objection the Clerk will again report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 25, after the word "immigration," insert the words "under the direction of."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the Committee amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to have some explanation why this should be done.

Mr. SHATTUC. The amendments are to section 1, page 1, line 8; insert after the word "States" a comma instead of a period. And after the same word insert the following: "Or by any railroad or any other transportation." It is suggested that by

using the word transportation we might include all means of transportation, including steamboat, railroad, or omnibus, or whatever kind of transportation used. Then in line 12, section 1, after the word "vessel," strike out the words "or by the alien passenger if such alien passenger comes overland, within twenty-four hours after the arrival of such vessel in port or by such overland alien passenger upon application for admission" and insert in lieu thereof the words "or transportation lines." This is done at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Then, on line 25, page 2, after the word "immigration," insert the words "under the direction or;" that is to take the initiative away from the Commissioner-General and leave it with the Secretary of the Treasury as it is now.

Mr. PERKINS. Are those all the amendments offered?

Mr. SHATTUC. That is all that has been offered up to this time.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a moment, to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask in reference to one question which I could not understand in the bill as it is printed. I presume it will be explained by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does it pertain to this question?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. SHATTUC. What is it?

Mr. PERKINS. The bill as it reads says:

There shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of \$1.50 for each and every passenger.

That first section as it reads would impose a tax of \$1.50 on each and every passenger that comes to this country, whether he comes here to reside or whether he comes here for the purpose of business only. I have looked through the act to see if there was not some explanation by which this section should be modified so that it would only impose the tax upon those persons who are aliens coming here to reside, and not upon anyone who came here simply for the purpose of business. I have not found it in the act, but I am not as familiar with the act as my friend from Ohio, and I ask him where is the provision?

Mr. SHATTUC. What provision?

Mr. PERKINS. Which says that the tax is to be levied only on aliens coming here to reside.

Mr. SHATTUC. If the gentleman will read the bill which he has in his hand he will see that it excepts American citizens, citizens of the United States, of the Dominion of Canada, and of the Republic of Mexico.

Mr. PERKINS. But suppose the man comes from England?

Mr. SHATTUC. Then he would pay a dollar and a half tax.

Mr. PERKINS. The intention is to tax every man who comes from England on business, every traveling agent, every member of an embassy, or a tourist from England, and to say that he shall pay a dollar and a half to get into the United States?

Mr. SHATTUC. The passengers do not pay it; the steamship companies pay it.

Mr. PERKINS. Is that the law now?

Mr. SHATTUC. That is the effect of it. I presume it has been so for twenty-five years.

Mr. PERKINS. And the tax is collected on every traveler?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. A dollar and a half a head?

Mr. SHATTUC. Not a dollar and a half, but a dollar. If the gentleman will look at the type in which the language is printed, he will see that it is the old law.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not care what type it is printed in; I want to know what these provisions are.

Mr. SHATTUC. If I have my way, the law will be that every passenger pays, or the company pays, a dollar and a half on every passenger that comes to the country, except citizens of the United States, citizens of the Republic of Mexico, and of Canada. For all others that come here we will collect from the company one dollar and a half apiece.

Mr. PERKINS. That would apply to everyone that comes here by railroad?

Mr. SHATTUC. It is so now.

Mr. PERKINS. The railroads pay a dollar and a half a head?

Mr. SHATTUC. The railroad company.

Mr. PERKINS. Is there any other civilized country outside of China that levies a tax of this sort upon people coming into the country?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes; \$5 a head.

Mr. PERKINS. What country?

Mr. SHATTUC. Australia.

Mr. PERKINS. Oh, very likely.

Mr. HILL. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Do I understand that a person coming from England to spend a week in the United States for business purposes or for pleasure that a tax is laid of a dollar and a half for coming into the country?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes; but the steamship company pays it.

Mr. HILL. They pay a penalty for coming into the country?

Mr. SHATTUC. No. They pay their share of the police expenses, expenses attending inspection, and other expenses attending it.

Mr. HILL. Is it not about time we stopped it?

Mr. SHATTUC. No; I think not.

Mr. RAY of New York. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHATTUC. Well.

Mr. RAY of New York. Do you say that if a man comes in here by railroad he pays a tax?

Mr. SHATTUC. I have answered that ten times, and it seems to me that a great constitutional lawyer like the gentleman from New York should not ask the question again.

Mr. RAY of New York. Will the gentleman kindly answer my question? I do not see it.

Mr. SHATTUC. The gentleman does not see what?

Mr. RAY of New York. It says every passenger who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port to a port in the United States.

Mr. SHATTUC. That refers particularly to vessels.

Mr. RAY of New York. The bill does not say so.

Mr. SHATTUC. That is in the middle of the bill. The gentleman will find it if he reads the bill through. Mr. Chairman, I ask a vote on the amendment.

Mr. KLUTTZ. I see that this proposition exempts persons from the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico. I do not know from whence, except from those two places, anybody could come into the country by rail.

Mr. SHATTUC. The persons coming in pay this tax without knowing it, because it is paid by the steamship companies, who charge it over to the passenger.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask a question. Suppose an Englishman, residing at some city on the other side of Lake Ontario, comes to the city of Rochester, where I reside. The fare on the steamer is \$1; but coming from Toronto, he would under this bill, as I understand, be obliged to pay an additional \$1.50, though his only purpose in coming to Rochester may be to buy something from Rochester merchants. In other words, if this proposed law should be enforced—I do not know that it will be—it is going to cost a man who is not born in Canada \$1.50 in addition to the \$1 fare in order to come to Rochester and do business. This is my understanding of the bill, and I would like to know whether it is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to hear the amendment read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "immigration," in line 25, page 2, insert "under the direction or."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is not the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment just read is an amendment proposed by the committee. The Chair will state that a good deal of the discussion has apparently been directed to a series of amendments which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] has sent to the Clerk's desk, but which have not yet been reported. The question is now on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] presents a series of amendments, the first of which will now be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1, page 1, line 8, by inserting after "United States," a comma instead of a period, and then inserting after the word "States" the following: "Or by any railway or by any other mode of transportation from foreign contiguous territory to the United States."

Mr. McCALL. I should like to ask the gentleman who proposes this amendment whether it is necessary for a person coming into this country by rail, if he is not a citizen of Mexico or Canada, to pay \$1.50 under the existing law?

Mr. SHATTUC. A citizen of Canada will not have to pay it.

Mr. McCALL. Then, would not the effect of the amendment which the gentleman proposes be to require the payment of that tax in order to come into this country by railroad?

Mr. SHATTUC. Not at all.

Mr. McCALL. Then I did not understand the amendment as it was read.

Mr. SHATTUC. I have stated distinctly that citizens of the Dominion of Canada, citizens of Mexico, and citizens of the United States are to be exempt.

Mr. McCALL. But, as I understand, anyone else than a citizen of Canada or of Mexico or the United States coming to this country by rail would, under the operation of the gentleman's amendment, have to pay \$1.50 tax, and that is not the existing law.

Mr. SHATTUC. I said that \$1.50 was not the existing law; they pay \$1 now. We increase the tax by adding 50 cents. The old law provides a tax of \$1.

Mr. McCALL. I may have a wrong copy of the bill; but as I understand, the bill now before the House provides simply for this tax upon those who come by steam, sail, or other vessel; and the gentleman from Ohio proposes as an amendment to add those who come in by any transportation line.

Mr. SHATTUC. That is the law now.

Mr. McCALL. That is what I would like to have explained, because I do not see in the present law (which is printed in Roman type in connection with this bill) the provision to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. SHATTUC. An amendment will be offered correcting that—inserting in lieu thereof "or transportation lines," which will include railroad lines. That part of the bill is not very plain and will be corrected.

A MEMBER. How is the tax collected?

Mr. SHATTUC. The tax is collected by agreement of the Canadian lines, and they pay the tax themselves.

Mr. McCALL. Is there anything in the existing law including transportation lines in that general way?

Mr. SHATTUC. There is nothing that specifically provides who shall collect the tax on the Canadian lines. It is made permissive with the Canadian lines to make an arrangement with our Government officials, and they have been making such an arrangement for twenty years.

Mr. McCALL. Is that by law or by agreement?

Mr. SHATTUC. By law they are authorized to make the arrangement. In another part of this bill it is provided that this may be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, there are some things about this amendment that I want to be heard upon. Under the existing law of to-day, if a man not a citizen of Canada, if I may use that term, or subject of Canada, living in Canada, crosses over into the State of Maine to do any trading or visiting, he does not pay a dollar and a half every time he or any of his family come across the line. I live in a town right opposite the city of Woodstock, where we interchange visits frequently, and parties cross the line between the two countries for trade purposes every day. Nobody ever thinks of collecting a dollar and a half for the visitors or persons coming over to trade or for any other temporary purpose.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does the gentleman know why not?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. There is no law authorizing it.

Mr. SHATTUC. We do not make them pay here in this country, because they would retaliate at once and make our people pay over there.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. This amendment would make it imperative upon them to pay a dollar and a half if they were not citizens of Canada, as the bill calls the subjects of Great Britain living in Canada.

Mr. SHATTUC. Not at all.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Then I can not understand the meaning of the English language.

Mr. SHATTUC. Then the gentleman can not understand the English language. He ought to. It is very plain there that the citizens of Canada are exempt from the operation of the law.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. The term "citizen of Canada" is used. I was not aware that there is any such term as "citizen of Canada." If you will change that to "resident of Canada"—

Mr. SHATTUC. It is subjects of the Dominion.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. They are subjects of Great Britain and residents of Canada. If the gentleman will change that to "residents of Canada," excepting all persons residing in Canada, then I think the bill may not be subject to so much objection as it now is.

Mr. SHATTUC. I will say to the gentleman that long before he and I became statesmen this was the law as it is now.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I think not. There is no such law that I ever had my attention called to, and I have been a collector of customs along the frontier for some years, and had something to do with these matters.

Mr. SHATTUC. The gentleman means about the citizens of

the United States and those of the Dominion of Canada. That is the law now.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I believe that if you were to apply this to persons who crossed our border as they do up in the vicinity of the home of my friend from New York [Mr. PERKINS], and as they are doing in my own place, that instead of having it read "citizens of Canada," for there really is nothing of that kind, it should read "residents of Canada."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Offer that amendment.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I will, perhaps, when the time comes—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Now is the time.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. After this amendment has been adopted I may offer an amendment to change the word "citizen," in line 5, to "resident."

Mr. LESSLER. Offer it now! Offer it now!

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would destroy the restrictive character of this bill. All a man would have to do would be to move into Canada, where he becomes a resident, not a citizen, and then he would be free to cross the border into the United States, and the whole scope and object of this bill would be nullified. The term "resident" would impose no length of residence in order to establish it as the term "citizen" might under the laws of the country, and it would simply open the doors to the migration into this country which we are now trying to restrict and nullify the object of this bill, and especially the new features which have been engrafted on it at the request and demand of the laboring classes of the country. You might as well not pass this bill as to say that every resident of Canada—not a citizen, but a resident—can cross the boundary lines of the United States and come in. Why, all migrations from Europe would come to Canada and become residents and then cross the border.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman think anybody would become a resident of Canada to save a dollar and a half. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. They would become a resident of Canada for one day—

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. That would cost a dollar and a half, would it not?

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman thinks the steamship tax of a dollar and a half is of no importance. I will state that it is of such importance that it is diverting the passenger traffic to the Dominion lines of Canada, and the matter that interests the gentlemen from New England so much is the transportation on their railways down into the interior of the country. It is of sufficient importance to do that. A man will remain a resident of Canada for one day, come in in that way and escape the tax, and it will nullify entirely the purposes of this bill, which are to stop the migrations through the open doors of Canada, which is one of the great evils of which the Treasury Department now complains.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I do not raise the objection for any such purpose as is indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS]. I raise the objection for the reason that I believe it will prevent persons from coming across the border for trading or visiting or anything of that kind, whether it be up on the northern border of New York or on the border of Maine. And at the proper time I purpose to offer an amendment to strike out the word "citizen," in line 5, and insert instead thereof the words "subjects of Great Britain, bona fide residents of Canada."

Mr. ADAMS. What is a bona fide resident?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. One who has his home honestly there; not one who has gone there, as the gentleman seems to think they would, to escape the payment of a dollar and a half and expend \$25 in doing it.

Mr. ADAMS. Oh, no.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Now, I should like to ask the gentleman, who is on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as well as the Immigration Committee, and knows much more than I do about matters of this kind, what do we understand by citizens of Canada? Is there any such class of persons? I live on the border, and I never heard of them. I have heard of subjects of Great Britain residing in Canada and I have heard of Canadians.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say in reply to the gentleman that this very House has put that term into the Porto Rican bill and declared the inhabitants of the island of Porto Rico to be citizens of Porto Rico.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. That is an entirely different case.

Mr. ADAMS. So we have that distinction, which has been made by the House of Representatives. I will say to the gentleman, so far as the question of international law is concerned, that the term "citizen" is well understood to be a man who owes allegiance to a country and is subservient to its laws. The term "resident" has no such significance.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. The language of this bill complained of by the gentleman from Maine is existing law and has been in the immigration laws of the United States since 1882 at least. I have a copy of it here.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Does it apply to railroads?

Mr. RUCKER. It applies to the class of people in Canada that this bill applies to.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Will you please answer the question? Does the existing law apply to persons coming over the frontier on railroads?

Mr. RUCKER. It says:

That there shall be levied a duty of 50 cents for each and every passenger not a citizen of the United States who shall come—

I see it says—

by steam or sailing vessels.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I thought so. They cross back and forth—hundreds of them every day—on the railroad, to and from my town.

Mr. McCALL. As there seems to be a question here as to what the existing law is, I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUCK] that he permit this amendment to be temporarily passed over, in order that we may find out just what the existing law upon this point is. Of course if it is existing law I should be inclined to vote to reenact it; but if it is not existing law, then I think the committee should consider it more carefully.

Mr. PERKINS. It is not existing law.

Mr. McCALL. If it is not existing law, the committee has not been correctly informed.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL] that this provision has been put in the bill in order to cure the great evil that now exists, the coming in through the door of Canada of persons whom we desire to keep out. Unless I am very much mistaken it is a new provision of law, and it is put in for the very purpose which this bill is trying to accomplish, which the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS] will almost utterly destroy.

The information which comes to us from the Treasury Department to-day is that the law is being evaded through the transportation facilities by way of Canada. So great is this evil that recently the Treasury Department has sent additional inspectors to the various points of transportation on the Canadian frontier to stop it. The laws to-day are being almost nullified by the abuse of the open door through Canada, and the attention of the committee having been called to this fact, this provision was put on the bill both at the request of the Treasury Department and of the labor organizations of the country, to remedy this evil. I do not wish to repeat, but it is a very important matter; and if the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. POWERS] is engrafted upon this bill and residents of Canada are allowed to come in, it would defeat the purpose of the bill, which is to try to remedy this ingress through the ports of Canada into our country.

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] admits now that the provision embodied in this amendment is not a part of the existing law. It seems to me that it should not become a part of the existing law. It is an absurdity on the face of it that any person desiring to come into this country from abroad would come around by way of Canada and stop there in order to acquire a legal residence for the sake of saving a dollar and a half.

Now, if the gentleman can draw up an amendment so that people who come here from abroad—I mean from across the seas—by way of Canada shall pay \$1.50, there can be no objection. But in New England we have very intimate trade relations with Canada. We have a great border commerce, and people are crossing back and forth constantly, and we do not care to have the annoyance of citizenship being inquired into and this special tax levied on passengers who are traveling, for instance, from Chicago to Boston by way of Canada or in returning to Boston also by way of Canada. It seems to me an unreasonable provision to put in this bill, that people coming to and from Canada upon business or for only a temporary purpose, should be required to pay this tax of \$1.50. I hope that this provision will not be embodied in the law.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that this particular phraseology is the happiest that might be inserted in this bill, but something ought to be done, in my judgment, for the restriction of immigration. Almost every proposition that we have had that would have been restrictive has been defeated in this House by the local interests of gentleman who do not want to interfere with the trade of their particular towns. [Applause.] Now, I think that the word "passenger" is the better word. I think it will tend to keep out these people who are coming now through Canada. A gentleman near me just now told me that one Canadian steamship line has advertised that immigrants who can not get through at the port of New York can through Mon-

treah, and it is because we have not this real restrictive provision that ought to be in the law.

Again, Mr. Chairman, there is a large number, a very large number, of people who come here every spring from the Mediterranean ports. They come in February and March. They work during the summer season, and in the fall they go back by the thousands. I think that those people ought to be kept out. If you try to do it by the use of the word "immigrants," they say they are not immigrants; they are "tourists;" they are "visitors;" it is not their intention to reside here, and hence the steamship company will not pay this fee. I want something done that will be restrictive of this immense immigration.

I received in my mail yesterday a communication that I suppose contains a statement of facts. Among others is a comparison for January, February, March, and April of 1900 and 1901 and 1902 of the immigrants coming into this country. In the four months of the first year 149,000 came, in the second year 154,000, and thus far this year—I am speaking of the four months this year—230,000 have already come.

If that ratio is kept up, 700,000 of these people will come here during this year. Now nearly half of them are laborers—men and women. They are adults. We are giving to these people a participation to that extent in our labor field. Mind you, they are not the class of immigrants that we used to have. Years ago, when the immigration was large, it came from Great Britain, from Germany, and from the northern States of Europe; all welcome here, making good citizens; but now the immigration in a large degree is coming from the eastern borders of Europe and from the south, and in very many instances—in the majority of instances—they are not desirable additions to our population. Five years from now under a lax administration of the naturalization laws these people would be voters. I do not want the voting power of the United States diluted in that way. I want to see everything that is restrictive in this bill retained in it, and would be glad if much could be added to it. I would rather double that tax than to add simply the 50 cents that this bill proposes to the present law.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with every word that has been said by the gentleman from Iowa, and I go a great deal further. I think the immigration question is the most serious question before this country; but I believe that this tax of \$1.50 will not keep one single immigrant out of the United States of America. I do believe that this tax of \$1.50 on persons coming from Toronto to Rochester is a mere incumbrance of trade, and at the same time it will not keep out one immigrant, desirable or undesirable. Let this committee do what they should do, if they want to check immigration, and have some means by which they can do so without requiring a tax of \$1.50. What does that amount to in the way of keeping an undesirable immigrant from coming in? To prevent this undesirable class of immigrants coming in you must provide some other means than this tax. I say that this provision of a \$1.50 tax on every passenger will not stop a single one from coming in.

You simply have a provision which, if enforced, may be annoying, and interfere with legitimate trade between Canada and the United States, and will no more stop the tide of immigration than it will stop the tide of the Atlantic Ocean. So do not let my friend divert us from the question, which is a proper question to be decided here. Let him bring in an amendment by which immigrants will be turned back, and I will join with him, but when it comes to a mere annoying trade provision which, if enforced, will create incalculable annoyance to business and will not stop one immigrant coming in here, I see no reason for it. There is no reason for foolish legislation because we can not get wise legislation.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the gentleman not know that the great difficulty is in distinguishing, in the hurry of this investigation, between the passenger and the immigrant? You can not distinguish, you can not get the evidence to show that a man is an immigrant if he, who knows all about it and is a stranger, asserts that he is here for a temporary purpose—that he is going back. The only way you can make it exclusive is to recognize him in the character that you know he is; you know he is a passenger and you can not know that he is an immigrant. His friends are with him and they can all join in the same statement that he is coming here for a temporary purpose. There is no possible way of overcoming that without you keep tab on these men during a period of five years, and that is utterly impossible. So that if you change that word, in my judgment you take the substance out of this bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. PERKINS. I want to answer the gentleman from Iowa first. But first, I would like to ask him a question. Does the

gentleman from Iowa think that any man who desires to be an immigrant and come into this country to live will be turned back because he is required to pay 12 shillings for the privilege?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not know, but I know that many and many a family coming here have expended everything they had to get here.

Mr. PERKINS. Quite right.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think if there was an additional cost put upon their passage perhaps they would not come, and it is in the hope that they would not, that is, the class I have heretofore spoken of from eastern and southern Europe, that I favor this provision. I hope that they will not come, and it is because of that that I want this as one of the restrictions. It is not sufficient in itself, but it is one restriction, however, and I would multiply them to keep them out if I could.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Iowa. One at a time is sufficient.

Mr. ADAMS. It is a hard question.

Mr. PERKINS. It is a hard question. If the gentleman from Iowa will join in voting to impose an educational test, he will find it will stop many more than a tax of 12 shillings. He says no man can tell an immigrant from a man that is coming here on business. If my friend lived in New York he would not have made that statement. The great body of immigrants—

Mr. HEPBURN. Why, I spent three months in investigating this matter, and I have seen thousands of these people where the gentleman has seen one.

Mr. PERKINS. If a man can not tell a man coming from Italy and Poland or Hungary when he comes in on the train from Canada and reaches the port of New York—if the inspector can not tell the difference between such a man and that of an English-speaking man living in Canada—he must be a dull inspector.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, he could tell that; but he could not tell from his appearance how long he was going to sojourn in the United States, and that is the real question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a mere police and sanitary measure. It excludes beggars and insane persons, anarchists, and other classes inimicable to the public peace, public morality, and public health. It aims at that and nothing else. It does not aim to prevent the incursion of the hordes that annually come to this country for the purpose of temporarily engaging in mining, working in the lumber camps, and manufactories, and in railroad construction, intending to return to their own country when they have saved a small competence. It does not pretend to prohibit or prevent the addition of these hundreds and thousands of stalwart, able-bodied laborers to the number already at work in this country. Its enactment would not prevent the owners of our coal mines from populating the regions in which they are located with classes of alien laborers socially unfit for citizenship, who care nothing about citizenship, and are therefore essentially disqualified from becoming Americans.

Its enactment would not put an end to the systematic promotion of undesirable immigration by the steamship companies. As for the provision forbidding the owners of the trans-Atlantic lines from thus promoting undesirable immigration we all know it will not have a feather's weight in preventing the evil practice. As long as the law tolerates the addition of undesirable alien laborers to the laboring classes already here, the steamship companies will continue to promote the business they have heretofore fostered so carefully.

When this bill shall become a law (if it does become a law), how easy it will be for the Congress responsible for it to claim credit for the passage of a more stringent immigration law? From the beginning of this controversy down to this hour the demand of the workers in this country has been that the stalwart 6-foot laborer, capable of competing in the labor market with those already toiling for a living here—not the organ grinder or the beggar—shall be excluded. No effort has been made to meet this demand. This bill does not even squint at it. It is a wise police regulation.

In the interest of the maintenance of the public peace it excludes the anarchist, felons, and in general the lawless classes. In the interest of the public health it excludes those suffering from noxious diseases. But what have these restrictions to do with the greater and graver question involved? Absolutely nothing. From the beginning the laborers of this country have demanded the prevention of immigration, which is adding vast hordes of the lowest classes of European pauper labor to our population. We all know that this incursion of undesirable classes among the laboring classes is reducing the standard of living and the level of civilization in every city in the country and among all callings in which manual labor engages. Not only the seaboard cities, but all our large cities and the mining camps of Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Kansas, Colorado, and other mining States and nearly all places where there are manufac-

turing communities will soon cease to be American communities and become mere colonies of brutalized aliens, thousands of whom do not seek to learn our language or desire to learn the nature of our institutions. They are tempted to come to our shores by the one consideration that they can obtain a little better wages, save a little money, and return to their native countries after a term of years. Is the American Congress going to respond to the demand for the suppression of this kind of immigration?

The time is coming when a mere stump speech on the hustings by a lawmaker, citing the passage of such a measure as this, will not be received in quittance of our obligation to limit the immigration, not of beggars, cripples, organ grinders, and thieves, but of able-bodied laborers, most of whom are brought here by the great corporations and "captains of industry."

Mr. Chairman, I need not cite any proof that the complaints of the American laborer, who is the sufferer from this great evil, are just.

The tenement houses of our cities are infested by classes unknown in America a quarter of a century ago. Everywhere we see evidences of a change in the character of our laboring population. In every mining camp, in the industrial hives in our cities, on the construction trains—everywhere—we see men on whose countenances are stamped unmistakable evidences that they are not and can not become useful American citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. I ask an extension.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope the gentleman will be granted unanimous consent to continue his remarks for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, who will point out in this measure a single section, a single line, a single syllable that aims at more than mere police and sanitary regulations? Is there a just demand for nothing more? Is there necessity for nothing more than this?

I believe the time is coming when, notwithstanding the danger of being subjected to the criticism of demagogues who will seek to array the worthy elements of our foreign-born population against those who undertake to stand in the pathway of this evil, the time is coming when we must face the responsibility, when the American Congress must see to it that classes who in the very nature of things can not be Americanized shall be prohibited from taking up their domicile in the United States.

And in this connection another question arises. Our present naturalization laws were passed at a time when our immigration consisted of the very cream of the population of Europe. The large immigration between 1848 and 1860 was caused by political complications abroad. The great revolutionary movement of 1848 had provoked disquietude through all Europe, and had caused the general migration from the Germanic States of men who came here because they desired to live in a republic. They came here because they were republicans and sought the blessings of republican institutions. In those days those who came to our shores were compelled to make great sacrifices. If they were poor, it required years of economy to accumulate the necessary funds. Only the fittest came. Since that time the sources of European immigration have changed entirely. The immigration from Germany absolutely fell off between 1899 and 1900, while the immigration from other countries, of people who are confessedly less desirable as citizens, increased enormously.

The question which, sooner or later, must be answered by the American Congress is whether we are going to close the doors against the brutalized classes of alien laborers which until recently was almost unknown but which now form a large part of the annual addition to our population. I believe there is no civilized country on earth that has not within its borders persons who would be desirable as citizens of this country. Let them come. I think thousands are coming here every year whose presence will work injury to the welfare of the country. Bar them out. The question raised may be difficult, but if the Congress had done its duty long ago it would have been made utterly impossible for a shipload of laborers to come here from a European country, nine-tenths of them leaving their families behind them, not one in ten intending to settle in the country, and who, having worked one, two, or three years at the most, take their savings and return to their homes in the old country.

If this is to continue, the level of the wages and the standard of living of the laborer will continue to fall until finally under "the iron law" of wages, which allots to the laborer only the wage necessary to maintain him in such condition that he can continue to work and propagate his species, the American laborers as a class will sink to the level of their alien competitors—the level of European pauperism.

The question is whether the American citizen, native or naturalized, whether born here or in Germany, Holland, France,

Sweden, Norway, or Switzerland, is to be submitted to unlimited competition with the most debased classes of the Old World? Shall this unlimited competition against the pauperized classes of the Old World fix the standard of living, and thereby the standard of respectability of the American laborer? Shall we continue to permit alien laborers to leave their families behind, come here as mere sojourners, live and labor under conditions repulsive to all our ideas, hundreds occupying a single building, sleeping in bunks ranged on the wall much as the shelves in a store, and subsisting at nominal expense—are we to permit them to drag down the standard of living and the standard of self-respect hitherto prevailing among American wage-earners? If so, farewell to every hope and aspiration which labor has a right to indulge.

As a police measure this bill improves existing laws and I favor its passage. It does not even aim to prevent the immigration of able-bodied pauper laborers. Therefore it does not meet the necessities of the situation as they appear to the wage-earners of the country.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Immigration if he will accept this amendment: In line 7, after the words "foreign port," insert these words, "other than those on the Great Lakes," so that it will read "who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port other than those on the Great Lakes to any port within the United States."

Mr. Chairman, at Niagara Falls visitors come in by rail across bridges; at Detroit they cross in ferry boats as well as on the cars, hundreds of travelers, not immigrants, who wish to visit and travel in our country. Under this bill they must pay a dollar and a half for the privilege of being in the country perhaps for an hour or two.

There is a line of boats running from Toronto to Wolcott on Lake Ontario, which is just below Lockport; also a line running from Toronto to Charlotte, 6 or 7 miles from Rochester, and a line of boats running from Toronto to Lewiston, at the mouth of the Niagara River, and during the summer these boats are filled with travelers from England, Germany, France, and other countries, passengers who land in Canada and want to visit Niagara Falls. They come, also, by way of the St. Lawrence from Quebec and Montreal for the purpose of visiting that historic and picturesque spot. Now, it seems absurd that these passengers, travelers, pleasure seekers for the moment, should be compelled to pay a dollar and a half each simply for landing in the country for two or three days to visit Niagara Falls and the other places of interest in that vicinity.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I will state to the gentleman that the amendment makes it apply equally to railroads as it does to steamboats.

Mr. ALEXANDER. It has not been accepted yet.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. No; that is what we are discussing, that amendment making it apply to every passenger who crosses by rail, as well as boat, to your city or any other.

Mr. RUCKER. Does the gentleman understand that this language does not apply to any citizen of Canada?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Certainly; but there are hundreds of English people, Scotch people, and other foreigners, who visit Canada in the summer, who go over to Niagara Falls and other places of interest on this side for a day or two, and the word "passenger" would compel them to pay a dollar and a half for the privilege of crossing from Clifton to Niagara Falls, just to spend an hour or two.

Mr. SHATTUC. If it were my own money that was at stake, and the gentleman asked for this contribution to his people, I would give it, but the United States Government needs this money.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, no; it does not.

Mr. SHATTUC. Besides this, the administration of this law will be in the hands of our Secretary of the Treasury, and he will not make rules that will be obnoxious at all.

Mr. HILL. Oh, well, let us have it a matter of law.

Mr. ALEXANDER. What would the gentleman from Ohio say if the English Parliament should assess every American coming across the Channel to Dover a dollar and a half additional to his fare, simply for the privilege of visiting England?

Mr. SHATTUC. I should say they were a very enterprising set of people. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Business people.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I move this amendment in line 7, after the words "foreign people," to insert the words "other than those on the Great Lakes," so that, with the other pending amendment, all visitors entering this country from Canada, other than citizens of Canada, may come without the payment of a dollar and a half, whether they come by rail or by boat.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Maine who have referred to

amendments that they wish to offer, that the chairman of the committee [Mr. SHATTUC] has furnished the series of amendments which he desires to offer, and it will be in order first to pass upon the amendments submitted by the chairman, in order to avoid confusion. These amendments having been passed upon, the section can then be perfected by disposing of other amendments. Debate on this amendment is now exhausted, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I call for the reading of the amendment that we are voting on.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 1, page 1, line 8, by inserting after the word "States" a comma instead of a period, and by inserting after the word "States" the following: "or by any railway or any other mode of transportation from foreign contiguous territory to the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 12, amend by striking out after the word "vessel" the words "or by the alien passenger, if such alien passenger comes overland, within twenty-four hours after the arrival of such vessel in port, or by such overland alien passenger upon application for admission" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "or transportation line;" in line 25, page 2, after the word "immigration," insert the words "under the direction or;" so that it will read:

"That there shall be levied, collected, and paid a duty of \$1.50 for each and every passenger not a citizen of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada or of the Republic of Mexico who shall come by steam, sail, or other vessel from any foreign port to any port within the United States, or by any railway or other mode of transportation from foreign contiguous territory to the United States. The said duty shall be paid to the collector of customs of the port or customs district to which said alien passenger shall come, or, if there be no collector at such port or district, then to the collector nearest thereto, by the master, agent, owner, or consignee of every such vessel or transportation line: * * * Provided, That the Commissioner-General of Immigration, under the direction or with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, etc."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. All the amendments submitted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] have now been agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I have sent up an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, page 1, after the words "foreign ports," insert "others than those on the Great Lakes."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SHATTUC. I move that debate on this section and all amendments thereto be closed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the section as amended by inserting immediately after the words "United States," in line 8, the words "upon every alien immigrant coming," and to strike out the word "or."

I would state, Mr. Chairman, the effect of that amendment if adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that all debate on this section and amendments has been closed.

Mr. PERKINS. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. After a motion to close debate has been agreed to, debate on the motion to strike out the last word is not in order.

Mr. PERKINS. I merely desire to explain the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the committee has determined that no debate shall be in order upon this section.

Mr. CANNON. Unanimous consent can always be given.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to be permitted to explain the amendment.

Mr. SHATTUC. What is it that the gentleman wants to explain?

Mr. PERKINS. I merely want to explain it, not to say one word in the way of argument.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment should be adopted the result is this: The bill imposes upon every passenger that lands on the seaboard \$1.50. This is not changed by the amendment. The operation of the law, which is the present law, remains. The provision of new law, which has been offered by the committee, is to impose a tax of \$1.50 on every passenger who comes into this country from Mexico and Canada by rail. I think it is an unfair provision to impose that tax upon every "passenger," and the amendment is that the tax shall be imposed on every "immigrant" who comes by rail from Canada or Mexico.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SHATTUC. I simply desire to say that the amendment ought not to pass.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. I have an amendment to offer.

After the word "Canada," in line 5, insert the following: "the Republic of Cuba."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. POWERS of Maine. Division.

Mr. LESSLER. What is it all about?

Mr. POWERS of Maine. To give the Republic of Cuba the same rights that we grant to Canada and Mexico, it being the only other country on this continent that we want to give it to.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 50, yeas 22.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next section.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, insane persons, epileptics, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had two or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; paupers; persons likely to become a public charge; persons afflicted with a loathsome or with a dangerous contagious disease; persons who have been convicted of a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of all government or of all forms of law, or the assassination of public officials; prostitutes, and persons who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes or women for the purpose of prostitution; persons whose migration to the United States has been induced by offers, solicitations, promises, or agreements, parole or special, express or implied, of labor or work, or service of any kind in the United States; and also any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes; but this section shall not be held to prevent persons living in the United States from sending for a relative or friend who is not of the foregoing excluded classes: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude persons convicted of an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude: *And provided further*, That skilled labor may be imported, if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country; and the provisions of this section shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does not the chairman of the committee take precedence?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Alabama will withhold his amendment, the chairman of the committee has an amendment recommended by the committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for recognition when the committee is through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers the following amendment on behalf of the committee, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In section 2, page 3, line 23, strike out the semicolon after the word "States" and insert a comma in lieu thereof, and insert "and those who have been, within one year from the date of application for admission to the United States, deported as being under offers, solicitations, or promises or agreement to perform labor or service of some kind therein."

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama submits an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by adding as a new section, between lines 14 and 15, on page 4, the following:

"SEC. 3. That in addition to the persons excluded under the foregoing section, admission into the United States shall be denied to all persons over 15 years of age and physically capable of reading who can not read the English language or some other language; but an admissible immigrant or a person now in or hereafter admitted to this country may bring in or send for his wife, his children under 18 years of age, and his parents or grandparents over 50 years of age, if they are otherwise admissible, whether they are so able to read or not."

"That for the purpose of testing the ability of the immigrant to read the inspection officers shall be furnished with copies of the Constitution of the United States, printed on uniform pasteboard slips, each containing not less than 20 nor more than 25 words of said Constitution printed in the various languages of the immigrants in double small pica type. Each immigrant may designate the language in which he prefers the test shall be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on a slip in such language. No two immigrants listed on the same manifest shall be tested with the same slip. An immigrant failing to read as above provided shall not be admitted, but shall be returned to the country from which he came at the expense of the steamship or railroad company which brought him."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday in general debate I made—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to say to the gentleman from Alabama and the committee that other gentlemen of the committee desire to offer amendments to section 2, and without objection those amendments will be considered before this.

Mr. SHATTUC. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio what is his point of order?

Mr. SHATTUC. I consider that it is not germane.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman makes the point of order that it is not germane. All I have to say is, that this is a bill for the restriction of immigration. The amendment offered restricts immigration, and I think it must be clearly germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that he is informed that there are other amendments to section 2. Section 2 ought to be perfected before it is passed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, no gentleman claimed the floor, and therefore I offered my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from California has an amendment to present to section 2.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield the floor with the amendment pending, Mr. Chairman, until section 2 is perfected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be considered as pending as a new section while section 2 is being perfected.

The gentleman from California [Mr. COOMBS] sends up an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out on page 4, line 7, all after the word "turpitude" and all of lines 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the amendment read. I could not hear it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Is this amendment offered by the gentleman from California an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California is an amendment to perfect section 2. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is a new section to the bill.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And not an amendment to section 2?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has been twice reported; but without objection, it will be again read.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Chairman, I think that section 2 is intended to comprehend completely the classes of people who are to be excluded from coming into this country under this bill. The language which this amendment seeks to strike out, if left in, is such a qualification of the exclusion which is intended by the section, as, in my mind, to entirely invalidate and vitiate it.

Section 2 provides that idiots, insane persons, epileptics, paupers and those who may become a public charge, those infected with loathsome and contagious diseases, convicted of a felony or other crime not involving moral turpitude, polygamists, anarchists, prostitutes, etc., shall be excluded from coming into the United States. Now, on page 4, it is provided, as an exception to that rule, that those who may be professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants, are excepted, although they may be within the class prohibited. That is a fair construction of it, although, of course, it is not intended so by the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. It does not read that way.

Mr. COOMBS. An anarchist, if he is an artist, may be admitted. Learned professors may come in although they might be preachers of the doctrine of anarchy in their own country.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. COOMBS. Very well.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If a man comes into the country as an artist and he was found to be an anarchist at some time, under the provisions of this section he would be admitted as an artist but excluded as an anarchist, because there is a specific section in the bill which excludes anarchists.

Mr. COOMBS. That is the point of it; it would admit him as an artist, but it could not exclude him as an anarchist. He has a peculiar exemption under the provisions of this bill; and, though he is an artist, although he has all of the traits of character inhibited in the first provisions of the bill, yet being an artist, he has a right to come in. It is my opinion that this exception should be

provided for in some other portion of the bill. I think the bill is faulty in that respect.

There is another part which I think must be stricken out.

Mr. GROW. Suppose it read "anarchists in any profession or business should be excluded."

Mr. COOMBS. That might perhaps be sufficient, I do not know. In lines 7 and 8 of this bill, on page 4, it is provided that skilled labor may be imported if the labor of a like kind not employed can not be found in this country.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that at one time that may have been a necessary part of the material progress of this nation, when industries were in their infancy, when in the formative condition, it might have been material to our progress to bring men in here skilled in a particular line. That time has gone by. I see no occasion now, under our present system, of continuing in force a provision the reason for which has gone by and has become obsolete.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. COOMBS. Certainly.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I desire to ask the gentleman from California if his attention has ever been called to the manufacture of lenses used in large telescopes. In Buffalo we have a manufactory of that kind, the only one, I think, in the United States.

Our people have found it absolutely necessary to go to Germany to find skilled workmen who can grind those lenses. This is an infant industry; it is a growing industry; it is a most important industry; and if the Secretary of the Treasury had not found some way of allowing skilled laborers in that line of work to come in under existing laws, the factory to which I refer would have been seriously crippled.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ADAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] a question. Is he on this committee?

Mr. ADAMS. I have that honor.

Mr. CLARK. Then I want to ask him about two lines in section 2—lines 8 and 9 on page 4, which are printed in italics:

If labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country.

Now, will not that provision open the flood gates to the importation into this country of all kinds of contract labor?

Mr. ADAMS. I think not, because if there should be skilled labor unemployed in the country, capable of doing the work in question, the skilled labor from abroad could not be imported. On the other hand, if there is no unemployed labor suitable for that class of work, then we need these skilled laborers from abroad.

Mr. CLARK. Now, let me ask the gentleman another question. Who is to determine whether there is in this country unemployed skilled labor of the kind which it is proposed to bring in under contract?

Mr. ADAMS. The facts of the case would be submitted to the officers of the United States, and it would be for them to determine the operation of this provision, as in the case of other provisions with respect to immigrants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was about to reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. COOMBS]. I am afraid that gentleman's mind has been in such a state of excitement and tension regarding the Chinese-exclusion bill during the present session that he is unduly apprehensive in regard to any legislation which may undertake to regulate immigration in this country. I think he has stretched the language of this section of the bill in a way which unduly arouses his apprehensions, and might lead to misjudgment on the part of other gentlemen, unless proper explanation be made. The gentleman certainly does not wish to stop the development of our country in the arts or sciences or manufactures by preventing the importation of skilled laborers, when there is a stringent provision that such importation shall not take place unless we need such labor, and unless there is in this country no such labor unemployed.

Mr. COOMBS. Is it proposed in this bill that the importation of skilled laborers shall be regulated by the Secretary of the Treasury—that he shall determine in what cases such importation is proper?

Mr. ADAMS. This whole bill will be put into execution under regulations laid down by the Secretary of the Treasury for its enforcement.

Mr. COOMBS. If that is the case, then of course I should not be insistent with regard to that particular part of my amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. Then I will proceed to answer the other part of the gentleman's argument.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I would like to state an instance that came within my knowledge where skilled mechanics were required in certain knitting mills, and no laborers of the necessary kind could be found unemployed in this country.

Mechanics who were being brought in to meet that necessity were held up in the city of New York, but upon the presentation of the case to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Immigration and showing the facts those laborers were admitted to the country for that special and infant industry.

Mr. ADAMS. I could mention half a dozen of such industries. For instance, the silk industry, or the designing of patterns for cotton prints, etc. There are innumerable cases in which it may be necessary to import skilled labor to aid us in carrying on infant industries. I need not say to my friend from California that the genius of the American people is such that they are constantly creating new industries that demand development, and these new industries are entitled to the same protection that has been accorded to similar industries under similar circumstances in the past.

On one other point I would like to relieve the apprehension of the gentleman. He supposes that there may apply for admission as an immigrant some one who is a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde—who is, we will suppose, an anarchist on one side and a play actor on the other. But in such a case, if there should be found on any side of the man's character any unfitness for his entrance into this country, he may be excluded.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that this bill provides in section 2 that no person "convicted of a felony" shall be admitted. Now, I wish to ask whether there is any provision of the existing law or any proposed provision in this bill which will be effective in excluding persons of that class?

Mr. ADAMS. The provision of the law or of this bill on that subject will be just as effective as any law can be.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does this bill amend the existing law in that respect? Does it make the present remedy applicable in such a case any more effective?

Mr. ADAMS. I think not.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, will the gentleman permit me to state briefly an incident that came under my notice showing the necessity for the amendment of the existing law in order to secure the exclusion of ex-convicts?

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. If it is simply proposed to leave the law as it is now, I think this incident will show the absolute necessity for some sort of remedy. I was in Chicago to see a friend, a lawyer, and was told that he was at the criminal court. I went there and he was engaged in the trial of a murder case. The defendant, Frank Mulkowski, was on the stand, a very intelligent appearing man about 40 years of age. He was convicted and hanged for murder. He had been in this country six months, had gone to his boarding house and murdered the wife of the man with whom he boarded, robbed her of her jewelry, rings, and a little watch or something of that kind. He had come straight from Europe, straight from a penitentiary after having served twenty years of a life sentence for a murder committed there when he was 19 years of age. So that the law to-day, if not to be amended by this bill, permits ex-convicts, ex-murderers to be pardoned in Europe and have free access to this country.

Mr. BARTHOLOMT. But it does not permit it.

Mr. ADAMS. I will call the attention of the gentleman to the provision contained in line 13, page 3, which excludes "persons who have been convicted of a felony or other crime."

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But it does not exclude them. You say they shall not be admitted, but they are admitted. Why was not that man kept out?

Mr. ADAMS. Of course you can not enforce a law anywhere unless you know that its provisions have been broken.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There is no provision of the law by which you can determine whether the man has been an ex-convict. Why is not some provision made requiring the man to bring a certificate from the mayor or some other officer of the town in which he resides that he is a person of good moral character before he is permitted to get on the ship, and not permit a man to come direct from the doors of a penitentiary, as Frank Mulkowski did, in Chicago, and commit murder six months after he comes here?

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman may not be aware of the fact, but we have agents in Europe who are supposed to look into the records of these people who do come.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit me to call his attention to section 13 of this bill? The section provides generally for a list or manifest to be made out by the master of the vessel, showing the character of the person whom he is shipping over here, and it says that list or manifest shall be verified "by the signature and the oath or affirmation of the master or commanding officer or the first or second below him in command, taken before an immigration officer at the port of arrival, to the effect that he has caused the surgeon of

said vessel sailing therewith to make a physical and oral examination of each of said aliens, and that from the report of said surgeon and from his own investigation he believes that no one of said aliens is an idiot, or insane person, or a pauper, or is likely to become a public charge, or is suffering from a loathsome or a dangerous contagious disease, or is a person who has been convicted of a felony or other crime or misdemeanor." etc.

That is the only provision in this bill to exclude ex-convicts from our shores, that the captain of the ship, interested in getting all the money he can from the people whom he brings over here, sends the surgeon of his own ship down to examine the people and see whether they have loathsome diseases, and on the report of that physician this officer makes oath that he thinks the man has never been convicted of a felony. It is a perfect farce on the face of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. I will say as a matter of practice, because the law stands to-day as proposed by this bill, that the Treasury Department has what you might call detectives in Europe whose sole business is to look into the moral character of emigrants who may come out, and they keep track of the criminals and try to stop them. It would be impossible for this Government to have a recognized officer in Europe, under international law, to hunt these people up or to look into their records any more than in general, and as for demanding a certificate from the mayor or other officer of the place from which the emigrant comes, I think that would be a very stringent provision and would be casting a slur on every honest emigrant that comes to this country—that he must bring a certificate of character. It is not required.

Mr. COOMBS. May I interrupt the gentleman a minute, just to say that since the consideration of this proposed amendment the members of the committee sitting here have agreed upon an amendment which, I think, will meet my ideas and cure the objections I have urged. If it is agreeable to the committee, I should like to withdraw my amendment, in order that they may introduce theirs.

Mr. ADAMS. Being a member of the committee, I shall be very glad to acquiesce in the action of the committee.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will my friend from Pennsylvania permit me a moment?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes.

Mr. COOMBS. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to withdraw his proposed amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUCKER rose and was recognized.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that time has been yielded to me by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania can not yield time under the five-minute rule.

Mr. ADAMS. I had five minutes allowed to me, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that under the five-minute rule he can not yield his time.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER], a member of the committee, was to have been recognized next.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have framed an amendment which will meet all of the objections that have been urged to this section thus far. I will send it to the Clerk's desk and let the Clerk read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all between "country," in line 9, to the word "shall," in line 10, and insert the following: "And provided further, That the provisions of law applicable to contract labor."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri submits this amendment to be read in his remarks?

Mr. RUCKER. Yes. Now, Mr. Chairman, the qualifying clause of this proviso had reference to the contract-labor feature of this section, and with this amendment I think it is unobjectionable.

Mr. CLARK. How will that make it read?

Mr. RUCKER. It will make it read as follows:

And provided further, That skilled labor may be imported, if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country: And provided further,

That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants.

It makes them amenable to all the other provisions of this law, excluding objectionable classes, but admits professional men and those engaged in skilled trades, ministers of the gospel, etc., even though they are under contract. Ministers of the gospel, as I understand, are sometimes contracted with and brought here to take charge of churches. Under the legal construction of the contract-labor law they are contracted with, and therefore can not come. A theatrical troupe or company can not be brought here under contract for the same reason; but with this provision, exempting them from the operations of the contract feature of the law, it still leaves them amenable to all other provisions, and if they are afflicted with a contagious disease or if they are anarchists or in any other way objectionable to this law or come within any of the other excluded classes, then they could not come at all.

Mr. RAY of New York. If the gentleman will permit, I simply desire to call his attention to the fact that the words "and provided further" are equivalent to the word "except," and therefore, under section 2 as it stands, and under the language that you have inserted, under the pretense that a man's labor was skilled labor and that labor of a like kind unemployed can not be found in this country, or that he was an actor, or an artist, or a lecturer, or a singer, or a minister of the gospel, or a professor of a college, he would have to be admitted, even if an anarchist, a felon, diseased, insane, etc. In other words, such a person would not be within the meaning of the law or the provisions of section 2, even if he had all the diseases and defects—physical, mental, and moral—that you have described in the section because the exception is absolute and would not be excluded; and while I do not care to interfere with the bill in any way, I simply call attention to it, because you nullify the real purpose of the entire section by putting in those words and exceptions in the form the section now assumes. These exceptions are made by treaties, generally, and such persons should be admitted if not diseased, or if sound mentally and morally, etc.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, I can not accept the interpretation and the definition of the gentleman from New York, even if the provision of the contract-labor law shall not be held to include these gentlemen.

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, why not remove any objection or any question about it by adding an amendment at the end of that section. You provide that skilled labor shall come in. You provide that it shall not exclude actors, etc. Why not add at the end of the section, "if not within the other prohibited classes hereinbefore mentioned."

Mr. RUCKER. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. RAY of New York. Then say so.

Mr. RUCKER. I have no objection to that.

Mr. RAY of New York. Then I ask to add at the end of the section "if not within the other prohibited classes hereinbefore mentioned."

Mr. MANN. Is not one of the prohibited classes those who are under contract?

Mr. RAY of New York. Not in that section.

Mr. MANN. It is all in the same section.

Mr. RAY of New York. I would say, then, that perhaps that ought to be looked to a little more closely, and we can return to it hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHATTUC. I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague may be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the time of his colleague be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOMBS. May I interrupt the gentleman? I would make this suggestion. When the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri is accepted, and then the amendment of the gentleman from New York is accepted, it will cure it entirely. One should precede in its acceptance and the other should follow.

Mr. RUCKER. I would like to have the amendment read again.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WACHTER. I would like to have the amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks that the amendment be reported. Without objection the Clerk will report the amendment. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that the Clerk is unable to make the amendment coincide with the language of the bill. Will the gentleman

from Missouri kindly follow the reading of the amendment by the Clerk?

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all after "country," in line 9, to the word "shall," in line 10, and insert the following:

Mr. RUCKER. Wait a minute, Mr. Clerk. That is on page 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out all after "country," in line 9, to the word "shall," in line 10.

Mr. RUCKER. That ought to be amended so as to read between the word "country," in line 9, and the word "shall," in line 10.

The CLERK. To and including the word "shall?"

Mr. RUCKER. To the word "shall." Between "country" and "shall."

The Clerk read as follows:

And insert the following: *Provided further*, "That the provision of law applicable to contract labor," so that it will read: "And provided further, That the provisions of law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to include professional actors," etc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will correct the amendment.

There was no objection.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless there are further amendments to section 2—

Mr. RAY of New York. Now, I understood the amendment I suggested was to be accepted, to add at the end of the section, "Provided such persons are not within the other prohibited classes herein before specified."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York offer his amendment?

Mr. RAY of New York. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, which the Clerk will report:

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the section: "Provided, That such persons are not within the other prohibited classes hereinbefore specified."

Mr. CURRIER. Are not contract laborers in the prohibited classes?

Mr. RAY of New York. You say "that skilled labor may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country." Now, you say that the provisions of this section shall not be held to exclude "professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of religious denominations, professors of colleges, or persons belonging to any learned profession or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants," and then the amendment added to that would be "if not within the other prohibited classes hereinbefore specified."

Mr. CURRIER. But contract labor would be within the prohibited class.

Mr. MANN. In the beginning of the section are the words "that the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States."

Mr. RAY of New York. That is right.

Mr. MANN. One of those classes is composed of persons whose immigration into the United States has been induced by "offers, solicitations, promises, or agreements, etc., to labor and work," so that we could have this one prohibited class. Now, probably the court would construe your amendment only applied to the other prohibited class, because this is one of the classes in this section.

Mr. McCALL. The gentlemen can frame it so as not to make such a strain on the semicolon. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may go on with the bill and return to this paragraph at a future time, and I will put my amendment in such shape as to be unobjectionable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when this paragraph is perfected it may be passed without prejudice as far as returning to it is concerned.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment that I wish to offer.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding, after the word "classes," in line 2, page 4, the following: "Provided, That all persons immigrating to the United States above the age of 16 years shall produce a certificate of good character from the local municipal authority of the country in which they last resided, or of some official representing the United States in such country."

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The question was considered, and the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I am in order at this time, but I would like to offer an amendment to

this bill which appears to me to be of great importance. It would take the place, in my judgment, of what is going to be proposed by some gentleman on the other side as an amendment, called the educational test. My amendment will much more effectually exclude undesirable immigrants.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood from the Chair that as I yielded for amendments to the section I was to be recognized when it came to an amendment for a new section. If the gentleman from Missouri rises to offer a new provision, I think I should have precedence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is correct in his statement. The Chair was listening to hear the full statement of the gentleman from Missouri to be sure that the Chair was right. No amendments are in order except the amendments to perfect section 2.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Very well, Mr. Chairman; I am willing to withhold my amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, it has been an hour or more since my amendment was read, and I would like to have it again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be again reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the bill by adding as a new section, between lines 14 and 15 on page 4, the following:

"Sec. 3. That in addition to the persons excluded under the foregoing section, admission into the United States shall be denied to all persons over 15 years of age and physically capable of reading who can not read the English language or some other language; but an admissible immigrant or a person now in or hereafter admitted to this country may bring in or send for his wife, his children under 18 years of age, and his parents or grandparents over 50 years of age, if they are otherwise admissible, whether they are so able to read or not."

That for the purpose of testing the ability of the immigrant to read the inspection officers shall be furnished with copies of the Constitution of the United States, printed on uniform pasteboard slips, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 25 words of said Constitution printed in the various languages of the immigrants in double small pica type. Each immigrant may designate the language in which he prefers the test shall be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on a slip in such language. No two immigrants listed on the same manifest shall be tested with the same slip. An immigrant failing to read as above provided shall not be admitted, but shall be returned to the country from which he came at the expense of the steamship or railroad company which brought him."

Mr. MANN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. I understood this was offered as a new section—as section 14.

The CHAIRMAN. No; section 3.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is offered as a new section between lines 14 and 15 on page 4.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane, and I will not take up the time of the committee to discuss it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is so purely germane that I will not occupy the time of the committee, and I ask for a ruling by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would point out in passing on this question that an examination of this bill shows that it is a general immigration measure, the title being "to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States." Section 35 repeals all other laws inconsistent with this law. Any amendment to this bill, in the opinion of the Chair, which is clearly and distinctly connected logically with the general scope and intent of the bill would be germane.

Section 2 provides restrictions upon which aliens shall enter this country; it limits the number of aliens by classes who may enter this country. This amendment provides for a new section, adds a new restriction, an additional restriction, to the class of persons who may enter under our immigration laws.

It is not the province of the Chair to pass on the merits or demerits of any amendment, or its wisdom or justice. It appears to the Chair that this amendment is clearly, distinctly, and logically connected with the general scope of a bill regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States, and under these circumstances the Chair feels constrained to overrule the point of order and hold that the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I explained to the House what this amendment was. There may be some members here this morning that were not present yesterday afternoon, and I merely desire to occupy the time of the committee for a very few moments, to state what is the object and purpose of this amendment.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the gentleman's attention—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman from Tennessee will wait until I have finished, I will answer his question. There is

an impression in some portions of the United States and with a large number of people that there are some restrictions on immigration to this country other than paupers, criminals, and persons unhealthy and blind and disabled, but as a matter of fact there are none. Now, this provision merely is intended to provide for an educational test as to the admission of immigrants into the United States.

It is a very liberal test, it is a very fair test, and it is not harsh or restrictive in any particular. It merely provides that the man who is coming to this country to become a citizen of the United States, to have a voice in the management of our Government, and to exercise the right of governing us as well as himself, shall be able to read the Constitution of the United States when he enters our country for that purpose, either in the English language or in his own language.

It further allows that man to bring with him his children who are under the age of 18 years, whether they can read and write or not, and allows him to bring with him his parents and grandparents, whether they can read or write or not, if they are over 50 years of age, thereby providing that families shall not be separated, allowing the whole family to come here together.

Now, why should we adopt such an amendment? It is certainly liberal; it is certainly reasonable so far as it goes. Why should we say that an educational test shall be established instead of adopting some other method? Simply because the educational test comes nearer to accomplishing what we want to do with as little risk, as little expense to the Government of the United States as any other method that can be devised.

I recognize, as I said yesterday, that the educational test is not always a test of intelligence; but what we want to do is to encourage immigration to this country from northern Europe. We want the Swedes, the Norwegians, the Frenchmen, the German, the Irishmen, the Englishmen, the Scotchmen, and persons from intelligent Europe to come here. We want to keep our lands open for them. Now, sir, the statistics show that of the people coming from that portion of the world as immigrants to this country only about 5 per cent can not read, 95 per cent can. Therefore, of the select class of immigrants that we want, we shall, if this amendment be adopted, get 95 per cent and shall only reject 5 per cent. On the other hand, of the class of immigrants that we do not want—the people from southern Italy—43 per cent of those can not read or write, as the statistics show; but really the percentage is greater, because these statistics have been gathered by simply taking the word of the immigrants when they come here, without making any actual test.

We have simply taken their own statements. Therefore if we are right in wanting to exclude that class from admission into the United States, then by the adoption of this amendment we exclude 43 per cent of this undesirable class and only 5 per cent of the desirable class of immigrants. This test is to be made at the port when they arrive here; but the steamship company that gathers them up and brings them here—the steamship company and their agents—will apply the test before they leave the country on the other side, because under the provisions of this amendment if the immigrant can not comply with the test the steamship company must return him to the land whence he came. Therefore very few who can not comply with the test will come here and need be returned.

Now, why should we adopt the amendment? I say it is as much our duty to protect our country against undesirable immigrants from Europe as it is to protect the children in our homes from undesirable society.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the reasons which I gave yesterday to show that this amendment should not be adopted—that it would tend to exclude a desirable class of immigrants, men who would do the drudgery that this country requires and which possibly the American laborer refuses to perform—in addition to that reason as showing that it would be unwise and impolitic to adopt the amendment, I wish to state this additional reason: That it will not only exclude people who can not read or write, but will have the effect of frightening away from our shores the desirable class of immigration described by my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. He admits that under his amendment it will be necessary that the test be applied on the American shore.

Now, if this threat be held out to the German immigrants (to whom it seems bouquets have been thrown by various speakers), I predict that very few Germans, unless they are professors or scientific men, will be willing to undergo an examination on this side of the Atlantic upon a technical document like the Constitution, whether it is to be read in one language or another. Such people—people who come over here to earn an honest living and who are conceded to be a desirable addition to our citizenship—will ponder a long time before they will make a long journey across the ocean in order to submit themselves to an examination

by some "smart Aleck" of an inspector who may refuse them admission because they have not read with the proper emphasis or with the proper observance of punctuation a technical document like the Constitution of the United States. I warn gentlemen on the other side of the House as well as on this that if they are going to insert any drastic restrictions like this in the present bill, they may just as well put in the bill the declaration "We do not want any immigration of any class."

I agree perfectly with the ruling of the Chair; I have no complaint to make on that score. But I hope that unless this amendment be properly amended—and I do not see how it can be amended, because I believe the nature of the provision is such as to place it beyond the power of surgery—it may be voted down, because when you make that kind of a threat and say that people before they can emigrate to this country must submit to a kind of teacher's examination upon the shores of the United States, you will have very few to emigrate to this country, and we shall see the stream of hardy immigrants who have been coming to our shores for all these years turned toward South America or some other country where they will not be pestered with such drastic restrictions as these.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] which provides that no person shall hereafter come into this country who is unable to read and write the Constitution of the United States is a most dangerous and selfish proposition. I am opposed to it, and I am opposed to the bill with that proposition in it. I am surprised that it should be offered by one of the leading Democrats of this House, and apparently favored by nearly all of the Democrats. Slurs have been cast by some gentlemen against the immigration to our country from southern Europe. The Italian, Polish, and Bohemian immigrants have been harshly denounced. I rise again to say a word in their favor.

I assert that they do not make bad citizens. I say, on the contrary, that they make good citizens. Most of them are hard working and economical. They come to this land partly for greater liberty and partly because they can do better here. They leave home and friends and family on the other side of the ocean, and, enduring all sorts of hardships, they come here because of the hope that their children may enjoy greater comforts and a better education than they or their fathers were permitted to enjoy. I do not care whether they can read or write when they come here or not. The love of liberty is not confined to those who can read and write. The love of children is not denied to those who can neither read nor write. Reading and writing do not determine intelligence. These immigrants coming here to us have learned how to do their work and do it well. That is sometimes better than knowing how to read and write. In my opinion it would be better to keep out the mechanic who can read and write and who comes here in competition with the mechanic in our country rather than to keep out the laborer who, after he arrives here, will consume with his family his share of the products produced by others.

I am not in favor of a narrow-minded, selfish, stingy view of immigration.

Mr. Chairman, I understand very well that there is quite a prevailing impression upon the part of the people of our country of American descent who have not come in contact with the foreign-born population or their children that the foreign-born population, or a very large proportion of it coming here—possible ignorant so far as reading and writing are concerned—is a menace to the future of our country. Now, I happen to represent from the city of Chicago what would be known there as a silk-stock district, but I deny all of those charges concerning the foreign-born population and their descendants, and I say without hesitation that an observation of some years in our city, largely composed of foreign-born population, and more than half composed of people foreign born and their children, has convinced me that the children of these people coming here from other countries, attending the public schools, taking an interest, as they do, in public affairs, make just as good citizens as those whose ancestors came over in the *Mayflower*.

Observation everywhere in these large cities, where you come in practical daily contact and experience with the descendants of the foreign-born population, is to the effect that they take a greater interest in public affairs, oftentimes, than the Americans themselves; that they give as great attention to every question of public policy; that they become the very best of citizens, the children almost invariably attending public schools. I heard the gentleman here yesterday read an editorial from the Post of this city, purporting to quote a statement by some gentleman from the Austrian Parliament. That statement, if ever made, was untrue. You go into the city of New York and you will find with their books under their arms, going to school, the descendants of the children of the foreign-born population in larger proportion than you will find in the purely American neighborhoods.

Our American people have gotten to the point in many places where the wealthy think it is unwise to send their children to the public schools, but the foreign-born citizen sends his children to the public school, where they come in contact with all classes and where they are prepared to become good public-spirited citizens. The city of Chicago is composed largely of the foreign-born people. We have a population of the Polish larger than any other city in the country; we have a population in many of the nationalities larger than the cities in the countries from which they came. They are among the best citizens we have in the city of Chicago. It is true that to a certain extent they yield a preference to their own nationality, but I have yet to see a native of a foreign country who is more clannish than the native of America itself.

There is less cry on their part of nationality than there is on the part of the American citizens. Oh, yes, perhaps they may have been ignorant when they came. Their children are not ignorant after they have been raised here and sent to the public schools, and the first generation makes good citizens, the second generation makes better citizens, and there is no occasion for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], whom I highly respect, to offer the proposition that he has. I have a few Polish people in my district, and the only evidence of ignorance that I find on their part is that almost without exception they vote the Democratic ticket [laughter], but I have belief and hope that as their children go to the public schools and become educated, as they will, that they will become wise enough to abandon not merely the leadership of my friend upon this proposition but upon the other heresies of government which he constantly advocates. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Chairman, when the amendment was being discussed imposing a tax of a dollar and a half upon people coming into this country from Canada and Mexico and other countries, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] said that an amendment materially affecting that amendment—

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. We are not discussing that question of a dollar and a half.

Mr. McCALL. If the gentleman will have patience I will, in my own way, get to a discussion of the question. It was said that it would have an adverse effect upon the bill to change it in that particular. Now, that proposition to impose a tax of a dollar and a half upon immigrants would have no more effect in restricting immigration to this country than a mere cobweb; it would keep out nobody whom it was not desired to have here.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], which is now pending, is an amendment that will restrict. It will shut out a great number of immigrants. I am not opposed to those people to whom this amendment would apply—I am not hostile to them, but I believe it would be wise for us to pass some measure that would have the effect of restricting to a certain extent immigration to this country. Some six years ago I offered a bill in substance in the form of this amendment. It was considered by the Committee on Immigration; it was exhaustively debated in the House of Representatives; it came to a vote, and it passed this House by 195 to 26.

At that time we had been having hard times in this country. There was a great industrial depression. The labor market was overstocked, and the cry of labor to Congress was for some measure that would give relief. We are not in that condition to-day; but I want to call the attention of this committee to this consideration: We protect the products of labor; our great corporations that are engaged in manufacturing have their products protected; but the labor, that which is the chief element in that production, they get free of duty; and they are entirely willing, while their product is protected, that they be permitted to bring into this country almost unlimited numbers of laborers to diminish the cost of production.

Now, I fear we shall at some time in the future see industrial depression again. We shall have overproduction; we are going to have hard times, and then we shall have the same cry of labor again. I submit that the time for us to treat this subject is now, so that we may not have a menace to our labor; so that our laborers, perhaps in the near future, may not be compelled to enter a grinding competition with each other and thus induce a ruinous decline of wages.

Mr. ADAMS. Are we protected against the capital of Europe?

Mr. McCALL. No; we do not need any protection against the capital of Europe. But I would like to ask my friend if he has not repeatedly held forth to the people of this country that we needed to protect our labor against the laborers of Europe?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; we do.

Mr. McCALL. And I would like to ask my friend further if he did not vote for this bill six years ago?

Mr. ADAMS. We do need to protect our labor against the laborers of Europe, but that is no reason why we should not allow others to come here to enjoy the privileges of this country;

and then we will protect them. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. If his object is to restrict immigration to this country, either in toto or any particular race, why not meet the issue fairly and squarely, and pass a law stopping all immigration, if that is the evil? Or, if it is against any particular race or class of people, why not pass a law against them, and not try by indirection, by an educational test, to get that done which you do not meet fairly and squarely? Do not keep out the honest, healthy man, who loves liberty as much as the most highly educated man in the world. Do not keep him out simply because he can not read and write. Let him contribute to the country his labor, which is just as valuable as money or any other consideration.

Mr. McCALL. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech, but I asked him if he did not vote for this proposition when it was before the House six years ago.

Mr. ADAMS. I think not.

Mr. McCALL. I should be very much surprised to find that the RECORD showed he did not.

Mr. ADAMS. I think not.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding:

"Provided, That all persons, whether able to read the English language or some other language or not able to do so, who shall enter the United States except at the seaports thereof, or at Vanceboro, Me.; Newport or St. Albans, Vt.; Plattsburg, Niagara Falls, or Buffalo, N. Y.; Detroit or Sault Ste. Marie, Mich.; Pembina, N. Dak.; Sumas, Wash.; Laredo, El Paso, or Eagle Pass, Tex., or Nogales, Ariz., shall be adjudged to have entered the country unlawfully and shall be deported as by law provided."

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] desire to be heard in favor of the amendment which he has offered?

Mr. SHATTUC. Yes; I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SHATTUC. It is held out to us that it is the desire of a large number of gentlemen in this House to restrict immigration. If we take their word for it, that seems to be all they want; that they are honest in their declaration that they want to keep out undesirable immigration, or, as I put it, undesirable aliens. Now, to put up the barriers at New York and on the Atlantic seaboard, as is proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], is simply to send these rejected people around, to come in over our frontier through Canada. There is no question about this at all, that there are a hundred thousand who come in in that way every year.

There is no question at all but what at least 50 per cent of the paupers, the insane, and the people who are fit subjects for our penal and charitable institutions who are turned away from our shores at New York come in through Canada. Before we get through with this I am determined to know just what part of this House is absolutely sincere and acting in good faith in relation to these matters. I do not propose to let it go without a record. I propose to find out who these people are who stand here and brag all the while that a good German, a good Englishman, or a good Irishman should not come to this country when they are willing to turn the paupers and harlots and insane and thieves away from our Atlantic ports, only to allow them to go around through Canada and come into our country in that way.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman from Ohio allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHATTUC. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Your amendment to my amendment is merely intended to designate the places at which immigrants shall come into this country?

Mr. SHATTUC. Certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am perfectly willing to accept that.

Mr. SHATTUC. Now, I want to say this, gentlemen: I see no objection to taking the question of an educational test up by itself, but it is my candid judgment that this bill ought not to meet with any riders at all. You also know that we have not revised the immigration laws for the last twenty-five years because certain elegant gentlemen of the East who have so many of these special features on their mind have persisted for years in forcing them to the front, and they kill every good measure by loading good bills down.

Now, I believe, with the advice of some distinguished attorneys of this House—the most distinguished, because I have never heard one of them deny it—that we can have an educational-test bill that would be satisfactory to every person here, and we can do it in such a way that it will not interfere with the treaty obligations that the United States has with other countries. I want

to urge you now to consider first one thing. Would it not be better to defeat this educational-test amendment now, entirely, and let it go back to the committee, and I will promise you a bill either for or against it? I do not know at this moment whether the members of the Committee on Immigration are for it or against it.

Now, I want to correct a statement made by the gentleman from Indiana yesterday, when he said he had it from me that my committee was against it. He never came before the committee. I do not want to impute to him any wrong. He did not intend to do so. He is one of those good attorneys that would not deliberately prevaricate and would not misrepresent. I do not now know how the committee stands. But I do protest in the interest of honest, fair play not to pile a lot of new issues on it and defeat the bill.

Mr. WATSON. I would like to ask the gentleman one question. Mr. SHATTUC. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman says they will bring in a report either favoring an educational test or opposing it. How can the committee bring in a report opposing a bill and have it considered in this committee?

Mr. SHATTUC. You can tell better than I can, for you went to the Speaker and found out how.

Mr. WATSON. I found out that you could not do it.

Mr. SHATTUC. We could report.

Mr. WATSON. But the gentleman says he will bring in a report.

Mr. SHATTUC. I did say something of the kind.

Mr. WATSON. Whether the House is for it or is opposed to it; and if the committee is opposed to it, it stands on no ground.

Mr. SHATTUC. I said I would submit it to the committee and see if they would not do one thing or the other.

Mr. WATSON. If they do the other, we will be out.

Mr. SHATTUC. If you will get our great constitutional lawyers, and we have a great many of them here, to bring in a proper bill in favor of the educational test, I will guarantee that we will consider it in the committee, but I ask you, gentlemen, to let us pass this bill without any riders.

Mr. RAY of New York. I would like to ask a question in that connection. Have you discussed this matter of an educational test in connection with this bill in the committee? I do not ask what you said.

Mr. SHATTUC. We invited everybody that wanted to come before that committee.

Mr. RAY of New York. Was the question of the educational test discussed in your committee?

Mr. SHATTUC. We went over the matter. We have had hearings, but it was our understanding that it was better for us not to report one way or the other upon an educational test or on the questions affecting the Canadian frontier.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHATTUC. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the time of the gentleman may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SHATTUC. Now, this bill that is presented by these two distinguished lawyers—and I guess they are, for both of them admit it, the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from Indiana—is the most loosely drawn measure ever presented to this House, so far as I know. If I had a clerk 15 years of age who could not draw a better bill than that I would discharge him, and I have had many. Neither one of these gentlemen drew up this bill; neither one of them wrote a word of it. It says:

In addition to the persons excluded under the foregoing sections, admission into the United States shall be denied to all persons over 15 years of age and physically capable of reading who can not read the English language or some other language.

I want to state to these gentlemen who have been talking about Canada, in discussing another section of this bill, that you will have to have a man standing at the border with a primer and spelling blocks to see whether the immigrant is educated. "Every person coming into the United States must be able to read." That means a man coming from Canada or Mexico, and you could not enforce it if it passed.

Now, in my time I would like to have the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] state what he thinks about this proposed amendment. He was solicitor of the Treasury, and if you have any doubt about the constitutionality of this bill, refer to him. The Speaker having no confidence in me, because I was a plain ex-railroad man, did submit it to the gentleman from Iowa. Now, as an educational test, I would like to have the gentleman from Iowa analyze this proposed amendment and see if he does not think it is a monstrosity. [Laughter.]

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. SHATTUC. Very well.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Section 2, the one under considera-

tion, provides that idiots and insane persons and epileptics, etc., shall be excluded; and also persons afflicted with diseases, etc.; and then at the end of the section is this proviso—

Mr. SHATTUC. That proviso has been amended.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Very well; that was done while I was out.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment, or rather a substitute, for the educational test, which in my judgment, and in the judgment of those who have given some attention to the great problem of immigration, will more effectually meet the evils of undesirable immigration than the amendment of my friend from Alabama. Before I offer it, however, I hope the committee will bear with me while I say a few words in regard to the educational test.

The amendment proposed means this, that every man or woman coming to the United States must show his or her ability to read 20 or 25 lines of the Constitution of the United States, and not until then will he or she be accorded the privilege of admission to this country.

Let us see what a President of the United States said on this proposition. I will read it myself. The same bill was before Congress a few years ago and a Democratic President vetoed it, and in doing so he used this language:

The best reason that could be given for this radical restriction of immigration is the necessity of protecting our population against degeneration and saving our national peace and quiet from imported turbulence and disorder.

I can not believe that we would be protected against these evils by limiting immigration to those who can read and write in any language twenty-five words of our Constitution. In my opinion it is infinitely more safe to admit a hundred thousand immigrants who, though unable to read and write, seek among us only a home and opportunity to work than to admit one of those unruly agitators and enemies of governmental control, who can not only read and write, but delights in arousing by inflammatory speech the illiterate and peacefully inclined to discontent and tumult. Violence and disorder do not originate with illiterate laborers. They are rather the victims of the educated agitator. The ability to read and write, as required in this bill, in and of itself, affords, in my opinion, a misleading test of contented industry and supplies unsatisfactory evidence of desirable citizenship or a proper apprehension of the benefits of our institutions. If any particular element of our illiterate immigration is to be feared for other causes than illiteracy, these causes should be dealt with directly, instead of making illiteracy the pretext for exclusion to the detriment of other illiterate immigrants against whom the real cause of complaint can not be alleged.

This, Mr. Chairman, states the case in a nut shell.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes; if the committee will extend my time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have fifteen minutes, reckoning from the time he started.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the gentleman from Missouri may use fifteen minutes for his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask the gentleman to let me read a few sentences from the message of another President in this connection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. LEVER. Half a minute.

The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure by a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test some intelligent capacity to appreciate American institutions and act sanely as American citizens.

That is from the message of President Roosevelt December 3, 1901.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to that sentiment expressed by President Roosevelt in his great message, but it will be noted that the President carefully refrained from indorsing a proposition such as is offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LEVER. Now, will you allow me to read from the Republican platform of 1896?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Oh, no; we know all about that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Perhaps it would do more good if the gentleman would read it to the other side of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. WACHTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the gentleman from Missouri offer his amendment. I do not know what it is he is talking about.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment will be, in my judgment—and I have devoted twenty years to the study of the question of immigration—the effect of it, in my humble judgment, will be to shut out those whom we do want and to let in those whom we do not want. It will let in the soft-handed, easy-going fellow, and exclude the horny-handed son of toil. It welcomes the lazy, half-educated good-for-nothing who goes around asserting that the world owes him a living without condescending to work for it, and shuts the door of the Republic in the face of the honest, industrious, and struggling man who, though not able to read, comes here with two strong arms, a

healthy mind, and a determination to make this country his and his children's home, and to earn his citizenship as well as his daily bread by the sweat of his brow.

One is perhaps driven to these shores against his will and by circumstances he does not care to explain—I refer to the educated immigrant—while the other comes voluntarily, with the hope of a better future in his heart and with the expectation that by honest toil, to which he is accustomed, by thrift and frugality, he will succeed in making his lot a happy one, because he is in the land of civil and religious liberty of which he has heard so much and which has filled his dreams for many a day. Yet it is proposed here to extend the hand of welcome to the former and not only withhold it from the latter but to send him back to the dungeon whence he came.

Do you know what this means—the deportation of a man? It means that you brand him for life. When he goes back to his old surroundings the question will be naturally asked by his neighbors, "Why did you return? You must have committed some overt act, some crime or other which caused the great country beyond the seas to return you to your old home." Nobody in the whole civilized world will believe that this country would return an honest man merely because he has not had the opportunity of learning how to read. My friends, by adopting this amendment you would go on record as making it the standard of Americanism that a man, no matter whether he is honest, if he has not had the opportunity to learn, will be punished on account of the lack of that opportunity on his part and be sent back where he came from.

Heretofore the rule recognized by the American people has been that an honest man, with an honest willingness to become a good American citizen, and by honest work to help build up our great country, that such a man should be welcomed by us; and it is due to this policy, my friends, that our country has been built up.

Such arguments as those used to-day by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] we heard advanced in the early fifties, when the Know-Nothing party attempted to shut out all immigration for all time to come. Supposing, my friends, that that party could have had its way, supposing at that time all immigration should have been stopped, what would have been the result? Is there anyone here who believes that the United States would have made the strides that they have made? Or is it not a fact that since the Know-Nothing party was voted down and out, and because of the fact that the doors were kept open to worthy immigrants, the last fifty years have been the most prosperous and the most glorious period in the history of our country?

Mr. Chairman, I shall offer, when the proper time comes, the following substitute:

An examination, physical and other—

Meaning a mental as well as a physical examination.

Mr. WATSON. Why not say mental?

Mr. BARTHOLDT (reading):

An examination, physical and other, of every immigrant shall be made at the port of embarkation by the American consul at such port and by a medical officer designated by the Treasury Department for such purpose.

Mr. WACHTER. Why does not the gentleman include the word "mental" in describing the examination?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am willing to put that in.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And you ought also to insert the word "moral."

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I am willing to accept the suggestions of these gentlemen and make the language of the amendment read:

An examination, physical, mental, and moral.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read, in support of this substitute, an extract from a letter written by a gentleman who is now in the consular service of this country, and who now enforces, without authority of law, this very provision. Here is his language:

This is probably the only United States consulate where for some years there has been a consular inspection of emigrants. Let me tell you how this work is being done, with a view to encouraging an effort to have this system of inspection extended to all seaports whence emigrants leave for the United States. In the height of the season from three to four steamers of the North German Lloyd Steamship Company leave this port every week and each steamer requires from two to three inspections of the steerage passengers. At first all the bedding of these people is ordered into the disinfecting chamber, then each person is vaccinated and his or her physical condition carefully examined into, special care being taken to detect diseases of the eyes, skin, lungs, and mind, etc. The examination takes place in the presence of the United States consul or one of his assistants, and is in charge of Dr. Peltzer, a sworn medical officer of our Government, who is assisted by one or two physicians of the Lloyd Steamship Company.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may continue his remarks for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, he continues:

As soon as trachoma, lupus, pulmonary phthisis, and certain other diseases or any mental trouble is discovered the person so afflicted is rejected, and the consul regularly sends the list of all rejected emigrants to the Commissioner of Immigration at New York or Baltimore or Galveston, whither the steamer

may be bound. At the same time the steamship company is also at once notified as to which passengers have been rejected at the consular inspection, whereupon they may, if they choose, investigate the cases more closely and determine for themselves whether or not they will risk taking such rejected passengers to the American port.

The system of consular inspection here at Bremen was introduced without any order from the State Department, but with its full sanction. If I am correctly informed it was begun at the request of the Lloyd people themselves, who evidently were prompted by a humane desire to have the fate of unfortunate emigrants decided at the earliest possible moment, and also by their own business interests, for it undoubtedly has saved them considerable sums of money to have people retained on this side who probably would have been excluded by the Treasury officials at our ports of entry and deported at the expense of the steamship company. And, as is well known also to the Department, the North German Lloyd Steamship Company spare neither pains nor money to have the inspection done right, and they regularly reimburse this consulate for the salary paid the examining physician.

Now, this is without authority of law. What we want is to get the authority of law for a system of this kind and pay the medical officer out of our own pocket. My friend writes further:

The records at the various immigration bureaus will show, I believe, that the work done at this port by the present system of consular inspection of emigrants has been fairly successful. I know that among the deported steerage passengers there are but very few that have passed the consular inspection at Bremen. In looking over the lists of such deported aliens which are regularly sent me I rarely ever find a person returned to Bremen on account of some physical disability, etc.

Mr. WACHTER. The main thing is not having a sufficient amount of money, is it not?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I propose that this substitute be adopted in place of the educational test. After deliberately thinking the matter over; after months of consultation with people who know all about the question of immigration, and after a practical test such as is described in this private letter, I have come to the conclusion that if you examine the emigrant on the other side, before you allow him to come over to this side and run the risk of inhuman treatment by having to deport him, we will meet all the evils that are now being complained of with relation to immigration.

Mr. WACHTER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. WACHTER. Does my friend not believe that if this educational test as proposed were adopted it would practically amount to an examination on the other side by the steamship owners? Would they not provide themselves with these cards, knowing that if they brought an undesirable person over here, one not admissible under the rule, that they would be compelled to take that person back? Would not they themselves make the examination on the other side in order to know that the person brought over here was admissible before bringing him?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Undoubtedly such would be the result, but I for one would prefer to have this system under the control and supervision of United States officers instead of leaving it to any steamship company or any of their agents.

Mr. WACHTER. The gentleman does not mean to do way with the examination on this side?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Not at all. The examination on this side will take place just the same.

Mr. WACHTER. And be of the same character as the examination on the other side?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I wish to merely suggest this to the gentleman: Does he not think that his foreign requirement or test would operate very seriously in excluding that German element who come to our country—young men who try to escape military duty? They come here for the purpose of escaping the military law, and if the test is put on them, as is proposed in your substitute, it would exclude that most worthy class. It would give notice of his purpose to come to the United States, and he would be stopped. That is what I mean.

Mr. LESSLER. They have an educational test at home. They can not get into the army without knowing how to read and write.

Mr. WACHTER. Oh, yes, they can.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. I am not so certain. I do not want to put any obstruction in the way of a young German coming to our country. They can stand the educational test.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I think the gentleman confuses my proposition with another proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Missouri be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I want to say to my friend on the other side [Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama] that a suggestion has been made frequently in connection with the question of immigration, looking to the inauguration of a system of consular inspection—a general system of inspection to be applied by all our consuls on the other side. That would not be desirable, Mr. Chairman, for this reason, that no man could get a certificate from an American consul to allow him to emigrate to the United States who would be subject to military duty, because an American consul accredited to any European country would have to refuse such a permit to persons who were amenable to the laws of that country.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. That is what I think. I think that any notice that was required to be given on the other side by a consul will accomplish a thing that will not be desired in this respect, that it might exclude a number of young Germans who possibly can not read and write, who leave that country for the purpose of escaping military duty, and come to this country. That is what I mean.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I assure the gentleman that the adoption of my amendment will not militate against the coming here of any such desirable immigrants as those. The inspection under my system would be made by the consuls at the seaports only, and would not require the issue of certificates.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. It does not, then, go to the effect that any particular notice or publication would have to be given by the consul. I am opposed to having the test made at a foreign port. We must have the test made here at home.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Not at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. If that test is to be given on the other side of the waters, I should object to it, for the reason that it would tend to exclude, in my opinion, a desirable element of German young men who very properly seek this country for the purpose of avoiding military duty, and ought to be allowed to come to our country. This country needs and demands a fair and reasonable immigration test and qualification. I shall support such a test and qualification.

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. This amendment provides that there shall be a test, "physical and mental." What mental test?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That would be left to the discretion of the Treasury Department and the State Department, under whose control the consuls are operating.

Mr. WATSON. Would they have the right, under the provisions of your amendment, to offer an educational test?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I suppose a consul, in determining whether an immigrant is worthy to become an American citizen, would go into the question of his mental qualifications certainly, even if, as is suggested by the other amendment, he would not require him to read the Constitution of the United States, an instrument which even very few of us thoroughly understand.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I will state to the gentleman that I am in hearty sympathy with what he has said—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I want to offer my substitute before my time expires.

Mr. SNODGRASS. What I wish to know is whether your amendment includes an examination as to moral qualification?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes; physical, mental, and moral.

Mr. SNODGRASS. That was the purpose of my amendment that I offered a while ago; but the gentleman has much better apprehended the scope of the evil to be avoided. I would ask him now if he has considered the cost of this medical examination?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I will say in reply to the gentleman that there are only five or six ports of embarkation in Europe. Consequently the expense would be very little, comparatively nothing.

Mr. CLARK. Really the expense under your system would not be as much as the expense under the present system.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Certainly not.

Mr. WACHTER. Is it provided that the present system of examination on this side is to be retained?

Mr. CLARK. Yes; but retaining it theoretically is not retaining it practically; and if Mr. BARTHOLDT's amendment is adopted, nine-tenths of the undesirable class will not get on the ships to come to this country at all.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of my substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri sends to the Clerk's desk a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], with the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUCK], and the Clerk will report the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for amendment providing for an educational test the following: "An examination, physical, mental, and moral, of every immigrant shall be made at the port of embarkation by the American consul at such port

and a medical officer designated by the Treasury Department for such purpose."

Mr. WACHTER. Would it not be proper to put the word "political" in there, in order to ascertain if they are anarchists?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That is covered by another section.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], made by him yesterday in the discussion of this bill, left the impression that the American Revolution, which resulted in the establishment of this nation, was the outgrowth of the action of ignorant and illiterate men, and that the literate or educated men of the country were substantially a unit in opposing opposition to the British Crown.

Possibly that is not the idea the gentleman intended to convey, but his remarks made that impression upon my mind and upon the minds of others. He used the following language:

Now, looking over the history of my country, I do not find any justification for the theory that illiterate men have been especially harmful to the American Republic. Going back to the very dawn of our national existence, I find that the men who led the forces, the intellectual power that created the great organization of Tories in this country were all of them the very best educated men. I am going to point out now that no evil ever came to this country, no evil ever menaced this country from ignorant men, and, on the other hand, I affirm that such menace did come from the educated men.

Look at the teachings of the Tories of the Revolution, and I always look to those people with a kind of sympathy, for they were the "regulars" of that day and we were the "rebels." They were the "loyalists," as they always called themselves. But they do not stand very high in the estimation of the historian or of the American people. The leaders of that class were all of them educated in the New England colleges. Four men of one single family, who were the outspoken leaders of Toryism, were graduates of three of the New England colleges of that period, and the educated people of New England and New York and Pennsylvania and New Jersey were the leaders of the Tory party of that day.

I desire to combat, and do combat, most earnestly the general idea conveyed by the remarks quoted.

The leading Tories of Revolutionary times were not men of the highest education, although some of them were college graduates. In New England the ministers of the Episcopal Church were largely college graduates, and the Episcopal Church quite largely adhered to the Crown and opposed the Revolution. On the other hand, the members of the Congregational Church and the ministers of that denomination, and I include all churches except the Episcopal, almost uniformly espoused the cause of the Revolution. There had been much contention between the churches, and the Episcopal Church took sides with the Crown and against the colonies mainly because other churches opposed the Crown.

Who were the Tories? Says Ryerson in his work on *The Loyalists of America* and their Times, volume 1, page 505:

Many men of property and character in Massachusetts were in favor of England, partly from conviction and partly from fear. That large and often cultivated class called "conservatives," who hold by the past rather than hope for the future and are constitutionally timid, feared change; they were naturally Tories.

Ryerson defended the so-called Loyalists or Tories and was prejudiced in their favor, and nowhere does he claim or indicate that the Tories embraced the highly educated or even the highly educated classes of New England.

Says Hosmer in his life of Samuel Adams:

Though Boston lost before the Revolution the distinction of being the largest town in America, it remained the intellectual head of the country. Its common schools gave every child a good education, and Harvard College, scarcely out of sight and practically a Boston institution, gave a training hardly inferior to that of European universities of the day. * * * The churches were thronged on Sunday and at Thursday lecture as they have not been since. All classes were readers; the booksellers fill whole columns in the newspapers with their lists; the best books then in being in all departments of literature are on sale and in the circulating libraries. * * * Of course the folk-mote of such a town as this would have spirit and interest. Wrote a Tory in those days (Sagittarius): "The town meeting at Boston is the hotbed of sedition. * * * Massachusetts was unquestionably the leader in the Revolution. * * * There is no way of determining how many New England militia took the field during the strife; the multitude was certainly vast. The figures, however, as regards the more regular levies have been preserved and are significant. With a population comprising scarcely more than one-third of the inhabitants of the thirteen colonies, New England furnished 118,251 of the 231,797 Continental troops that figured in the war. Massachusetts alone furnished 67,907, more than one-quarter of the entire number. * * * As Massachusetts led the thirteen colonies, the town of Boston led Massachusetts."

And Samuel Adams, a college graduate, led Boston. The leaders in the American Revolution against the British Crown, both those in civil life and those who won distinction in the Army fighting against Great Britain, were nearly all college graduates. I give a list of some of the more prominent, with the names of the colleges from which they graduated, and I include New York because the gentleman from Ohio in his remarks included New York with New England.

John Adams, graduate of Harvard; John Hancock, graduate of Harvard; Samuel Adams, graduate of Harvard; James Otis, graduate of Harvard; Joseph Warren, of Massachusetts, graduate of Harvard; Gen. Henry Knox, well educated; Gen. Artemas Ward, graduate of Harvard; Gen. Timothy Pickering, graduate of Harvard; Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, well educated; Gen. David Wooster, of Connecticut, graduate of Yale College;

Capt. Nathan Hale, of Connecticut, graduate of Yale; Alexander Hamilton, Kings College, New York, now Columbia (did not graduate); Robert R. Livingston, Kings College; John Jay, Kings College; George Clinton, De Witt Clinton, graduate of Columbia College, of New York; Patrick Henry, not illiterate; Thomas Jefferson, College of William and Mary; James Madison, Princeton College; James Monroe, William and Mary College (did not graduate); George Washington, of Virginia; Gen. Nathaniel Greene, Rhode Island, highly educated; Gen. Thomas Mifflin, Pennsylvania, graduate of Philadelphia College.

It is true that in the years immediately succeeding the close of the Revolutionary war less attention was given to education throughout New England and the entire thirteen colonies than formerly. This grew out of the fact that the eight years' war had impoverished the country, and the people were neither able to support the common schools or send their children to college or give much, if any, attention to education. All their energies were bent to the restoration of material prosperity.

The opposition in New England to the war of 1812 was not due to the ignorance of her people, but to the exposure of her coasts to the ravages of British fleets and armies and to the crippling of her merchant marine and business interests.

No man can point to a single Tory who won distinction in the Revolutionary war fighting against the cause of the colonies who was a highly educated man. On the other hand, as the list shows, those who won the highest distinction in the Revolutionary war fighting for American independence and managing the civil affairs of the governments of the colonies were highly educated men and mainly college graduates.

Equally absurd is the claim of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ADAMS] that only the ignorant should or do perform ordinary manual labor.

What are we to say of Lincoln, the rail splitter; Garfield, the canal driver, and Grant, the farmer and tanner? These men studied and read beneath the stars or behind the chinks of log cabins, and despised not manual labor, and won their way to the very highest places among their fellow-citizens.

To-day in all the walks of life we find the boys who have not the advantages of school or college educating themselves, and they despise not manual labor, nor do they regard it as degrading. Toil in the ditch or behind the plow, if it be necessary to earn an honest living, is no disgrace to any man, whether he be ignorant or educated. In the South to-day, where factories are springing up, the owners open schools and give the children and young men and women an opportunity to gain education, because educated labor is the more desirable and the more valuable.

I repudiate the idea that education lifts a man above honest manual labor or that honest manual labor degrades the educated man. Perish the thought that we must keep men in ignorance if we would have workers in wood and toilers in the field and mechanics in the workshops, or import ignorant labor if we would have our ditches dug, our crops planted, and our factories kept in operation.

We have not forgotten the learned blacksmith nor the hewer of stone who in old Scotland revolutionized the science of geology. Hugh Miller, with more learning than many a king, thought it no disgrace to fashion and place the stone as a common mason.

No more dangerous doctrine can be taught in this Republic than that which implies that the educated young man is above placing his hand to the plow or fashioning the machinery that moves the world. If anything makes a nation great and free and independent it is educated labor—men and women who are self-reliant because intelligent and well educated, who are willing and able to work with both hands and mind when occasion arises. That man is successful in life who, knowing how, is willing and not ashamed to do any work that ought to be done. The man who knows the qualities of iron and steel takes delight in fashioning them into useful implements, while the ignorant man beats into shape because it brings him bread. While doing his work the ignorant man is discontented and surly because his mind is indolent and unfed and unthinking. He wonders why others who work by his side are cheerful and contented. He does not appreciate that the difference comes from the broader views given the one above the other by reason of education and an understanding of the results to be accomplished and the good to come from the labor performed.

I insist that the prominence of our institutions of free government depends not on our wealth, but on the intelligence of the educated masses, and that if we would escape revolution we must see to it that our common-school system is perpetuated and extended and that well-educated men and women fill every department of life, high and low, and take pride in pursuing any and every avocation necessary to the existence and growth and development of a prosperous people and nation.

I have always believed and I still believe that our patriot fathers who fought at Lexington and Concord and Bunker Hill;

at Bennington and Saratoga; at Trenton, Princeton, King's Mountain and Yorktown, were intelligent and as well educated as the times would permit. I am of the opinion that the more education a man has the more he loves and longs for and appreciates liberty and good government—republican government—the more he desires to have a hand in governmental affairs.

Absolute monarchies exist because of the ignorance of the people. With the growth and spread of education has departed the glory of the throne and crown and scepter. Educated people repudiate the doctrine of the divine right of kings and teach the divine right of men to organize and govern themselves, in accordance with the intelligent popular will.

Educated men understand and respect law and good government. Ignorance bows to force because it fears, but neither understands nor appreciates the government under which it exists.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT] by no means meets the object that will be accomplished by the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The one will not lessen immigration and the other will.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said much about the quality of the immigrants that have come into this country, and of course we are all immigrants or the descendants of them. But I want to say to the committee that the most important question is not about the quality, but about the quantity, of the immigrants that are coming into this country.

We have had before us, in reference to various measures, remonstrances and delegations from trades unions that represent the great mass of wage-workers in this country, and I say, Mr. Chairman, that this measure that we are voting on now is of more importance to the wage-earners of this country than all the other bills that will be passed at this session a hundredfold over.

The one thing of greatest importance in the future development of this country, for its prosperity, and even for its safety and preservation, is that the great mass of the people should receive sufficient wages to maintain a reasonable standard of comfort and orderly living. It is not a question of quantity in the number of our people, but of quality; it is not how many millions of population shall we have, but what sort of a population shall it be.

No man can deny that the question of wages has got to be decided by the law of supply and demand. Why did we vote almost unanimously for the Chinese-exclusion bill? Because every man said and every man believed that to bring in possibly five or ten million Chinese immigrants would sooner or later reduce the price of wages in this country. Is there anyone who believes that this great body of five or six hundred thousand immigrants can continue to come in yearly without reducing the average price paid to wage-earners as soon as bad times come, and come they will, necessarily. And if there shall be in this country, whose Government rests upon universal suffrage, large masses of men who are not paid sufficient sums to satisfy their needs and to enable them to maintain their present condition of comfort, discontented, half paid, and half employed—is there any man in this committee who does not believe we shall have social troubles far more dangerous than those which arose from the existence of slavery fifty years ago? The advantage of the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is that it will, to a very considerable extent, lessen the body of immigration coming into the country by excluding those who can not read.

It is idle to say, no matter what the condition of prosperity may be, that any employer of labor pays more than he must pay. I do not care how much any man is making, he does not pay the wage-earner \$2 a day if any other man turns up who is willing to accept a dollar a day. If you have more laborers than labor, prices for work will go down and no one can help it. The theory on which protection is based is that it keeps up the price of wages, and that the salvation, safety, and prosperity of the country depends upon a reasonably high standard of wages and of general comfort and well-being.

Now, Mr. Chairman, does anyone believe that you can permanently keep up a high scale of wages by keeping out the product of pauper labor and letting in the pauper laborer himself? My friend from Missouri said that this country should be the asylum of the distressed of all nations. A great immigration was beneficial when we had 3,000,000 people in this country and untold millions of acres of vacant land. Now we have 80,000,000 people and the land still vacant is arid.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Do not the provisions of this bill prevent the immigration of paupers?

Mr. PERKINS. The term pauper labor is figurative. It means the men who work for a price materially less than the working-men of this country are willing to take, or ought to be asked to take.

Now, what we should consider, Mr. Chairman, is not the distress of other nations, but to do the most we can to avert distress in this nation. There is a natural increase with 80,000,000 of population of over 500,000 every year, and unless we see to it that those children that every day are coming into the world, American born, who will be American bred, shall have the facilities for comfort that their parents had, unless we see to it that we will leave behind us a bad heritage. We must see to it for their sake and for our own sake. Their prosperity and the national safety are linked together.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in regard to the general features of this bill, I approve it. I believe it is a good bill. I believe that the chairman of the committee is entitled to the thanks of this House for the perseverance with which he has labored to prepare it and get it before us. I approve of the bill, however, because of its prohibitory features; because it restricts immigration; and I am not averse to amending it and making it better by still further prohibition.

I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that he is mistaken in the opinion he expressed about "the gentleman from Iowa" being a Know-nothing. I lived in the days of Know-nothingism. I was opposed to all of the ideas of that party at that time. The questions that were presented then are not the questions of to-day. At that time, as the gentleman from New York has said, there were thousands and tens of thousands of square miles of prairie inviting the settler. We wanted immigration; and I am opposed to immigration now in part because there are no more lands; because immigration congests itself in the cities; because the people that come often are disappointed and are not benefited.

I do not object to immigration simply because of the degenerating effects upon our population. After a little time that difficulty is effaced. But I am opposed to it, among other things, because it is harmful, as I believe, to the very best interests of the United States and the very perpetuity of the United States. What sacrifices do we make in order to enlarge the labor field of the people of the United States? Every Republican who votes for a tariff proposition does it for what reason? Not simply that it will benefit us for a moment in extending, possibly, our commerce and give us a home market, but to enlarge the labor field and make more places where Americans can work, to raise the wage and keep it up to its standard. That is why we make these sacrifices, and that is what I think to-day is the great labor of statesmanship for the American people—to see to it that the labor field of the United States furnishes a place where every laborer may work and receive a fixed wage for his day's work.

As long as that can be done there will be contentment in our homes; as long as that can be done that contentment gives permanency, perpetuity, to our institutions. No man seeks a change who is prosperous under present conditions; and therefore I am unwilling to jeopardize that labor field that we have built up and extended at so great a cost to ourselves by flooding it with irresponsible people that we have no interest in. Every one of these 250,000 laborers that have come into the United States this year, and the number will be larger than that, is here to seek the place of some American laborer, to seek a place in this labor field even now too restricted. I do not want to subject our own people to this competition.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit me an interruption?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, if it is a question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If the argument of the gentleman is true, then would he not be willing to propose a bill to shut the doors of the Republic against all immigration?

Mr. HEPBURN. That is impractical—that would disrupt the pleasant relations that exist between ours and other nations. But I want to approach to that point as rapidly and as completely as we can. I do not want to be offensive to other nations—I do not want to excite reprisals in other directions on the part of other nations, but I do want to keep this labor field of America for Americans. [Applause.] That is the reason why I want to keep these people out.

We could do it if it was not for the congested condition of the cities. The gentleman from Missouri has a large German population in his city, and for some reason or other these gentlemen want their associates—their old friends—to share with them the blessings that they have. Another gentleman has an immense Polish population in his city, and he wants to conciliate their kindly feelings or secure them by letting their friends and their relatives come in and share with them.

Now, I think we ought to take a broader view than that; we ought to look at the situation as it is, as it affects the whole country and as it affects this labor field of ours, because that is the one thing that the Democrats and Republicans alike ought to look to. I can see a gradual change in the opinions of very many gentlemen on the other side of this House. The importance of

the labor field and the necessity for preserving it for our own people has impressed itself on them.

Mr. STORM. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. HEPBURN. Yes, if it is a question.

Mr. STORM. As I understand, a laborer is different from a mechanic. A mechanic comes here and is educated and can read and write, but laborers we do not raise in this country; we do not raise American laborers, as I understand it, nor American domestic servants, and, therefore, the remarks of the gentleman that they come in competition with ours does not apply.

Mr. HEPBURN. Oh, I think that is a distinction too refined for the comprehension of anybody except from the gentleman's own locality. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HEPBURN. I will occupy it to answer the question of the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa whether, in his opinion, the turning out of the noneducated laborers would affect the field of labor where there is a great surplus of labor as much as it would the farm laborers, and whether there is a great surplus in that direction now?

Mr. HEPBURN. No man that comes to this country or that ought to come to this country comes here with the expectation of always being a laborer. While that may be his vocation when he comes, if he is such a one as is fit to come, he aspires to other places speedily, to fitting himself for competition with the higher classes.

Mr. MANN. If that is true, it would have the effect to restrict immigration.

Mr. HEPBURN. If it does that, it pleases me. I was going to say that the gentleman from Illinois did not vote against it before, but I believe he was not here.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. I was here and voted against it before. I know I did on one or two occasions, at least.

Mr. HEPBURN. That may be, but the RECORD I had before me did not show that.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa a question.

Mr. HEPBURN. Very well.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The question may seem academical, but it is in the light of history very real indeed. Is it or not true that every immigrant who comes here is not only a producer, but also a consumer; and that, in the language of one whom I consider the greatest Speaker the House of Representatives ever had, Mr. Thomas B. Reed, "every immigrant practically brings his job with him?"

Mr. HEPBURN. And he does not take some other man's job?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. He does not.

Mr. HEPBURN. I supposed he did.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. He does not, and he furnishes a job for somebody else. In that light, if the gentleman looks at it he will see it with entirely different eyes from what he does now.

Mr. HEPBURN. Does the gentleman refer to that as a question? [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I asked if he is not a consumer.

Mr. HEPBURN. Right here I want to call attention to that portion of the veto message of a President which the gentleman did not name, and as a comment upon that I want to call attention to the fact that this House by a vote of 195 to 37 registered their disagreement with the opinion that the gentleman quoted with so much confidence.

Mr. SHATTUC. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HEPBURN. Certainly.

Mr. SHATTUC. That measure to which you now refer as having received so large a vote—is that now a law?

Mr. HEPBURN. Probably not.

Mr. SHATTUC. What became of it?

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not remember now. I think it was lost in the Senate.

Mr. WATSON. It failed in the Senate.

Mr. HEPBURN. But it passed the House originally by a vote of 217 to 36.

Mr. SHATTUC. The contention that I now make with the gentleman from Iowa is that this bill, if you tack this amendment on it, will meet the same fate exactly as that did.

Mr. HEPBURN. I think not; I hope not. If I thought that was true I would not vote for it.

Mr. SHATTUC. I am trying to persuade you that it is true.

If you gentlemen would only wait and let your committee bring in its bill, constructed on proper lines, I guarantee that the House will pass this bill and that one too; and that will be a great improvement on your amendment. That is my argument.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Chairman, in reference to immigration into this country the great question as to the welfare of the country is as to the character of the immigrant. Whatever test of character may be applied, the desirability of the immigrant as a citizen of the United States is the all-important question.

Is education—the ability to read and write—any test of real character? I know some people who can read a good many languages, yet who in what we call common sense and wisdom are great fools. To exclude from this country a class of immigration that would depreciate the quality of our civilization is proper. For that reason we exclude the Chinese. The Chinese people in character and in all the elements that go to make up good society as we understand it, would not be a desirable part of our population. Hence Congress has by law excluded that class of foreign people.

I am in favor of Asia for the Asiatics, for the reason that the Almighty, in His providence, has placed different races on different portions of the earth. Paul, on Mars Hill, said to the Athenians that God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of their habitation."

Asiatic civilization is peculiar. The Asiatic people have characteristics that it will take long generations to change so as to adapt them to our civilization. Hence there is a propriety in their exclusion. But the races that can be assimilated with our population and become a part of the society in which we live, whose characteristics make them desirable citizens, why should they be excluded on a mere educational test? Our Republic stands, the great beacon light on the shores of time, beckoning all the races of men on to a higher and more glorious destiny.

Why should we exclude them from a home on our shores when they are in all the elements of character fitted to become a part of the great elements of our strength and of our wealth—pioneers in the wilderness in time of peace and soldiers in time of war—ready when the rights or welfare of their adopted country are at stake to peril their lives, the same as the native born? Education has nothing to do with the great elements of character. The man surrounded by his family at his humble fireside is growing up in American society, under the influence of American schools, and his offspring in the first or second generation can not be distinguished from native-born Americans.

Why exclude that class of people, whose only defect is their condition in life, made so under the governments under which they were born? Why shut them out? Why deprive them of the opportunity of working out a better and a higher destiny for themselves and their children when they can not injure our civilization, but are calculated to aid like other citizens in advancing it?

A test applied to the human brain that would determine its intelligence, if there was such a test, might be desirable. But there is no yardstick or scales that can determine the question of a man's common sense, his honesty, his integrity, his frugality. A man who possesses these qualifications is a good citizen, though he may not be able to write his name or to read a word of the Constitution. If he is law-abiding, peaceable, ready to discharge the duties of a citizen, why should he be excluded from our shores?

Our fathers all came from abroad. They sought this New World, bequeathed by Columbus to mankind, and why exclude the unfortunate portion of the race, guilty of no crime and possessed of the same elements—energy, enterprise, and frugality—as the best of their fellow-citizens, who in their adopted country become as patriotic as any others?

Why, then, apply any test except that which may be applied as tests of character, not of acquisitions of learning? Make the qualification for voting what you please, but let there be no qualification which will exclude a man of good character and morals from the opportunity to earn his livelihood with his own right arm under God Almighty's sunshine on the face of any portion of God's earth. [Loud applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that the debate on the pending amendment and the amendment thereto close in ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks that debate on the amendment presented by him and on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri close in ten minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman make that twenty minutes, so that I may have ten minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will suggest to the gentleman from

Ohio that we agree to twenty minutes, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman in charge of the bill and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama amends his request and asks that debate on the amendment and the substitute be closed in twenty minutes, one-half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HILL. I shall not object to this request, but I shall object to any extension of time after this on any portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending section and amendment thereto be closed in twenty minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on the two amendments and the substitute be closed in twenty minutes.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the adoption of that motion bar additional amendment to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. Any additional amendments may be offered, but debate on the section and all amendments thereto will be closed.

Mr. CORLISS. Then I submit I should object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Michigan that ample opportunity will be given to all members of the committee to offer amendments.

Mr. CORLISS. I would like to ask if that motion would debar debate on my amendment which I propose to offer and which has no relevancy to the question under discussion?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion was to close debate on the section and all amendments.

Mr. CORLISS. I propose to offer an amendment to an entirely different section on a different subject, which will be in the nature of an additional section to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. I will state to the gentleman from Michigan that this motion would not affect debate on his proposed amendment. The motion of the gentleman from Alabama does not relate to any other than the question included in his motion. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to close debate on the amendment and the substitute in twenty minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion agreed to.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, as there was no division of time, I ask recognition, and I yield ten minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC].

Mr. SHATTUC. Where did you get ten minutes?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, there was no division of time, and I ask recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Alabama that we are still under the five-minute rule. His motion did not take it out of the five-minute rule. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I wish to state my objections to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOLT]. I did not intend to address the committee further, but I wish to state this: that the gentleman has offered a substitute to the educational test proposed by me, a provision that all immigrants who come to this country must stand a mental test, a physical test, and a moral test by the consular service of the United States. Now, if you are opposed to an educational test, why should you be in favor of this test, because you leave it entirely to the Department to determine what the test would be, and it would probably be along the same lines?

Why should you accept this other test and put the Government to the expense of appointing the consuls to do this work, appointing the examining physicians to do this work, requiring them to go to the consular officer and get their certificate, and as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RICHARDSON], my colleague, said, if that is the case, if they are required to go to a consular office, that consular office could not give a certificate without violating the comity between this country and other countries to a young man running away from there in violation of the military laws or any other laws, regardless of this test; but if you accept the amendment that I offer, the emigrant does not have to go to any consular office; he does not have to stand an educational test until he comes here to make a living. He may leave there because he does not want to serve in the army, but when he comes here there is no question raised if he can pass the educational test; he is admitted.

No one of them would be brought over here unless he was qualified, and why? Because the amendment provides that the

steamship company must carry the emigrant back who can not pass the test. Therefore, the steamship companies, in order to protect themselves, will apply the test to them before they start; not because of their regard for our law, but as a protection to themselves, so that they will not have to carry the immigrants back at their own expense.

As far as the Germans are concerned, I believe my friend stated yesterday that only about 2 per cent or 2½ per cent of the people of that nationality are illiterate. The figures I had showed a little more than that; but of the German immigrants coming to this country it would only exclude about 2 or 3 out of every 100, whereas it would exclude 43 or 45 per cent of the undesirable classes.

Now, I say, in reference to this amendment, the question simply is whether you are going to stand for home and country, or whether you are going to stand as a matter of sentiment for the indiscriminate, uneducated classes of Europe. You may give your sympathy and your sentiment to those poor unfortunate people, but are you going to bring them here to uplift them at the expense of your own people? I say that this proposition is to uplift the American wage-earner, to hold up the standard of American living, to hold up the American standard of civilization, and no self-respecting voter in this country will ever reprove a man who stands here and votes to uphold the American standard in that respect.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, a great many members of the committee have asked me how the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization stand on this amendment. I have no doubt there are several members of the committee who agree with my friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as to the merits of the amendment that he has introduced. The difference of opinion begins right here. They want to see some legislation pass this House that will become a law. They want to do something that will amount to something. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] professes great regard for the American workingman, but he is pursuing such a policy that it will do the American workingman no good at all, but will do him harm instead, because the measure that the gentleman advocates will not become a law, and he will also defeat the bill on which the committee have worked so hard to perfect it and get it before the House for action.

Now, what you ought to do is to reject this educational test as an amendment to this bill. Set it aside; pass this bill that has been so favorably spoken of by my friend from Iowa [Mr. HEBURN]. No man in this House understands the value of it better than does the gentleman from Iowa, because he was for a long time the Solicitor-general of the Treasury Department, and it is admitted by everyone that he was the best one the Government ever had, and he is familiar with this subject, and he speaks advisedly when he says it is an excellent bill. Now, I say to you gentlemen in good faith that if you follow the lead of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and of the distinguished lawyer from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] and attach this amendment to this bill, you may pride yourselves that you have accomplished a great result; but I ask you to watch and see if this bill does not go into a pigeonhole in the Senate, never to be heard of again.

On the other hand, reject this educational test, report this bill favorably to the House, let the House pass a properly constructed, legal bill, one that the Supreme Court of the United States will uphold, and we will send such a bill to the Senate as will receive favorable action there. If the House will do this, I pledge you that my committee, because I have just this moment consulted with the members of it, will report to this House within ten days a bill on the subject of the educational test, drawn on proper lines, in a way that will give no offense to other nations, and that will reach that class of people whom we want to reach. Now, I ask you in good faith to vote against this amendment. Vote against both of them; but if you must vote for either one of them, vote for the one introduced by the gentleman, my friend from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri was offered as a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], because the two amendments are not in conflict, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri might just as well have been offered as an independent section; so that the friends of the educational qualification might have voted for his amendment, because I think it will serve a good purpose. It is to provide for an inspection and examination of those immigrants in order to determine, in advance of their landing on our shores, as to whether or not they would be qualified for citizenship when they come here. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is to attach an educational restriction or qualification. For that reason I shall have to vote against the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri, because it is

offered as a substitute for the proposition of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that there are ten minutes remaining of the time allowed for debate on this section.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, in answer to what my genial friend from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] has said, I want to read the Republican platform of 1896.

For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor, we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

That is a specific indorsement of the pending proposition. And in 1900 the Republican national platform contained this clause:

In the further interest of American labor we favor a more effective restriction of cheap labor from foreign lands.

Mr. SHATTUC. We have that.

Mr. WATSON. Who is disputing that?

Mr. SHATTUC. Nobody.

Mr. WATSON. Then, in further answer to my friend, I will state that in the Fifty-fourth Congress this very proposition passed the House, passed the Senate, and went to the President of the United States, but he vetoed it, and the House then passed it by a two-thirds vote over his head, and it went to the Senate where it failed of the required vote.

Subsequently, when Senator LODGE was chairman of the Senate Committee on Immigration, this very proposition was presented and passed. Subsequently, when Senator FAIRBANKS, from my own State, was chairman of the Committee on Immigration of the Senate, this very proposition was presented to that body and passed. Now, what right has the gentleman from Ohio to assume, when this measure has passed the Senate once when it was Democratic and twice when it was Republican, that the proposition as now stated would not pass the United States Senate?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It is not the same proposition, if I may so state to the gentleman. The bill that passed the House and was vetoed by President Cleveland was afterwards passed over the veto of President Cleveland by this House and failed finally in the Senate, was a bill which only applied to male immigrants. It excluded females, and it contained a number of other modifications which, in my judgment, are absolutely necessary to perfect legislation of this kind. It was not to strike down the proposition which is now submitted.

Mr. WATSON. The bill was practically the educational qualification as provided in this bill, because when I drew the bill I went back to the original Lodge bill, as presented in the Fifty-fourth Congress, and took almost identically the same language; and my friend from Missouri was on the committee at the time the bill was reported.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I was chairman of the committee.

Mr. WATSON. Was chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And I reported it by instructions of the committee.

Mr. WATSON. I did not know how that was; but I know the gentleman reported the bill, and I believe in the passage of the bill and voted for it, but refused to pass it over the President's veto, if I remember correctly. However that may be, I am in favor of the qualification as provided in this proposition, because it accomplishes what ought to be accomplished. And in answer to my friend, the distinguished and venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania, permit me to say we do not exclude any great number of Germans. It will exclude but a small number of Swedes and Norwegians and English and Scotch and Irish and Welsh, but it will have the result of excluding great hordes of Italians and Huns who come in year after year, undermining the very principles of this Republic and interfering with labor all over this country. Labor everywhere is in favor of this. I have a letter from Samuel Gompers, who is president of the American Federation of Labor, that has just reached me, and I will send it to the Clerk's desk and ask to have it read in my time as the conclusion of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Several MEMBERS. Ask unanimous consent to have it read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to have the letter read.

Mr. WATSON. I understand my friend from Connecticut said that he would not agree to any unanimous consents, and I do not care to run against any Connecticut snags.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks

unanimous consent that the letter may be printed as a part of the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAMS. I object.

Mr. SULZER. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter read.

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman from Connecticut said that he would not grant any more unanimous consents. Why should he, therefore, be entitled to the courtesy?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that it may be read. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Chairman, the time has been limited already to twenty minutes. It will take about five minutes to read the letter. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be allowed five minutes after the reading of the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that there are five minutes of the twenty minutes of limitation still remaining. The Chair is of the opinion that the unanimous consent will not take away the time given for debate. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection, and the Clerk will read the letter.

The letter was read, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1902.

Hon. JAMES E. WATSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: I have observed with much pleasure your activity in the cause of the regulation of immigration, and in particular your introduction of a bill providing that no adult immigrant shall be admitted to our country till he has acquired the first rudiments of education. It is for this reason that I now address you with regard to pending and prospective legislation.

The organized workers of the country feel that the existing immigration laws, while not without their value, are of trifling effect compared with the needs and the just demands of American labor.

The elaborate bill reported to the House by the Committee on Immigration is for the most part a simple codification of the existing laws, and modifies them only in some few details. I believe that the changes proposed are for the most part desirable. They are, however, comparatively unimportant. If it is worth while to take up the question of immigration at all, it is worth while to introduce a genuine and effective regulation.

The strength of this country is in the intelligence and prosperity of our working people. But both the intelligence and the prosperity of our working people are endangered by the present immigration. Cheap labor, ignorant labor, takes our jobs and cuts our wages.

The fittest survive; that is, those that fit the conditions best. But it is the economically weak, not the economically strong, that fit the conditions of the labor market. They fit best because they can be got to work cheapest. Women and children drive out men, unless either law or labor organization stops it. In just the same way the Chinaman and others drive out the American, the German, the Irishman.

The tariff keeps out cheap foreign goods. It is employers, not workmen, that have goods to sell. Workmen sell labor, and cheap labor is not kept out by the tariff. The protection that would directly help the workers is protection against the cheap labor itself.

The Nashville convention of the American Federation of Labor, by a vote of 1,858 to 352, pronounced in favor of an educational test for immigrants. Such a measure would check immigration in a moderate degree, and those who would be kept out by it are those whose competition in the labor market is most injurious to American workers. No other measure which would have any important effect of this kind is seriously proposed.

The need of regulation may be less sharply felt at the present time, when there are less men out of work than there were a few years ago. But the flood of cheap labor is increasing, and its effect at the slightest stagnation in industry or in any crisis will be fearful to the American workmen.

A fall in wages or a relative fall of wages makes the workers unable to buy as large a share as before of the goods they produce. This hastens the time when overproduction or underconsumption will show itself. That means hard times; and when hard times come the mass of immigrants that prosperity attracted will be here to increase the burden of unemployment.

For these reasons the American Federation of Labor believes that the present opportunity ought not to be allowed to pass without the adoption of an effective measure for the protection of American labor.

I earnestly hope that you will be able to procure the embodiment of an illiteracy test for immigrants in the bill (H. R. 12199) which the House now has under consideration.

I have the honor to remain, yours, very respectfully,

SAM. J. GOMPERS.

President American Federation of Labor.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I merely desire to give expression to one thought in answer to the argument of my distinguished friend from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. The difference between the substitute offered by myself and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is that my substitute tends to relieve the American people and this country from the stigma and the meaning of the word "deportation." That is a word not contained in the lexicon of American history, a word not employed as yet by any American statesman whose lessons we care to obey and follow, a word comparatively new in the politics of this country. If you adopt my substitute the undesirable immigrant will be barred upon the other side. If you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama he will come across the ocean, and the American people will stand charged in the face of the civilized world with attempting to brand for life, and send back to his old home, a man merely because he is unable to read, because perhaps he has not had the opportunity of acquiring that knowledge.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. To which gentleman does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. "How happy I would be with either if the other dear charmer was away." [Laughter.] I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ADAMS. Perhaps we are both to ask the same question. I should like to ask whether the gentleman from Missouri has looked into the question of how the foreign governments would regard the provision that our consuls were to pass on the qualifications of their people?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I have, and there is absolutely no objection on the part of any government on the face of the earth, because the same practice is now in vogue in several ports of embarkation without the authority of law. I want to give that practice the authority of American law. And I will say that while the examination will take place practically upon foreign soil, it will really take place within the jurisdiction of the American consul. As soon as the American consul begins the examination and inspection of the immigrant, from that moment the immigrant is practically within the scope of our jurisdiction. Now I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SULZER. On page 10 of the pending bill, line 11, in italics, it provides that the officer at the ports of arrival shall make the examination, and the present law provides for an examination to be made at the place of embarkation. If the present law were incorporated into this, will the gentleman state how an immigrant entitled to admission to this country could be returned?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that my friend from New York has misunderstood the remarks which I have submitted. It is not the fact that the present law provides for any inspection and examination on the other side of the ocean. Not at all. It is only a practice which has been tried in several ports of embarkation and has worked very satisfactorily, so much so that no immigrant who has come to this country has been rejected on this side, because he has already passed a rigid examination on the other side.

Mr. SULZER. Does not the gentleman think that the examination ought to be made at the place of arrival as well as at the place of embarkation?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. My substitute does not exclude an examination on this side at all.

Mr. SULZER. It only provides for an examination at the place of embarkation?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired, debate on the amendment is exhausted, and the Chair will state the present parliamentary situation.

There is pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama inserting a new section in the bill after section 2, on page 4. To the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama the gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Immigration, has submitted an amendment. The gentleman from Missouri has offered a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama. The question, therefore, will first be upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. When this amendment is disposed of, whether adopted or rejected, the question will recur on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again read the amendment.

The question was considered; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WACHTER) there were 54 ayes and 13 noes.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I want to offer to the pending amendment which I think will take the precedence of the substitute.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HILL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 989. An act to authorize the Light-House Board to pay to Chamblin, Delaney & Scott the sum of \$1,704.46.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 14018. An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes.

IMMIGRATION.

The committee resumed its session.

The amendment proposed by Mr. LITTLE was read, as follows:

In the amendment of Mr. UNDERWOOD strike out "eighteen" and insert "twenty;" so as to read "under twenty years of age."

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri as an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests to the gentleman from Iowa that the vote now about to be taken—

Mr. LACEY. I offer as an amendment the same language which the gentleman from Missouri has offered as a substitute. If the proposition of the gentleman from Missouri be adopted as a substitute, of course the original goes out.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I submit that the amendment has already been perfected by the adoption of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio—

Mr. LACEY. It has not been perfected.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And the vote now recurs on the substitute offered by myself, which can not now be offered as an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] that the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama is still before the House, subject to perfection by amendment. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LACEY. I offer it in the same language as the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri, but as an amendment, not as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Iowa that he offer his amendment in writing as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LACEY. Very well. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama by adding the following at the end thereof:

An examination, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that there is now pending before the House the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama—

Mr. LACEY. And I offer an amendment to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has offered a substitute to that amendment; and the Chair suggests that the gentleman from Iowa can not in the way he proposes appropriate the paper pending as a part of the files of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. LACEY. I do not understand that there is any patent on it. The proposition is now offered in the nature of an amendment. This is a different proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the rule, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa should be reduced to writing and offered by him as an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. LACEY. That point was not made. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I call for a vote on the substitute.

Mr. LITTLE. As an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, I move the language which I send to the desk, to come in at the end of that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the educational examination herein provided for may be made by the consul of the United States at the port of embarkation, under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN (having put the question). The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 43, noes 53.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] is rejected. The question is now on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri, unless the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACEY] has his amendment ready to offer.

Mr. LACEY. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. LITTLE] offered the same thing substantially.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is then on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Missouri for the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SULZER. I ask that the substitute be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the amendment of Mr. UNDERWOOD providing for an educational test the following:

"An examination, physical, mental, and moral, of every immigrant shall be made at the port of embarkation by the American consul at such port and by a medical officer designated by the Treasury Department for such purpose."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The regular order.

The CHAIRMAN (having put the question on the substitute of Mr. BARTHOLDT). The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call for a division.

Mr. ADAMS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. If this substitute is adopted, does that pass it finally?

The CHAIRMAN. If the substitute be adopted, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama falls.

The question being again taken on the substitute of Mr. BARTHOLDT, there were ayes 34, noes 75.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, is it in order now to offer the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri as an independent section?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that until this section is disposed of an independent section can not be taken up.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be in order at the present time. This section is now being perfected, and the vote recurs on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I call for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Then I desire to offer it after the section is disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. SHATTUC. I call for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The House divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Eighty-six gentlemen vote in the affirmative.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio withdraws his demand for a division.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I renew the demand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois renews the demand for a division. Those opposed will rise and remain standing until counted.

The division was completed.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 86 and the noes are 7, so the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, I now offer the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri as an independent section.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the present section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that this present section, section 3, has been agreed to. No other amendments to that section are now in order.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I understand it is not completed until all amendments are disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. All amendments and the substitute and the new section offered by the gentleman from Alabama have been disposed of.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I had an amendment to the first part of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. All sections have been disposed of. The gentleman from Tennessee offers as a separate section the substitute of the gentleman from Missouri, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. An examination, physical, mental, and moral, of every immigrant shall be made at the port of embarkation by the American consul at such port and a medical officer designated by the Treasury Department for such purpose.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Mr. Chairman, the effect of that amendment is to add an additional moral qualification, which is not provided for in this bill, I think. It also operates for the convenience of the emigrant, and as it can be carried out with very little additional expense, I think it ought to be adopted as an independent section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee, which is a new section, as section 4 of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GLENN) there were—ayes 33, noes 41.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Chairman, when section 2 was passed unanimous consent was given to recur to that section for the purpose of offering the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 2, page 4, add the following:

"Provided that such persons are not within other excluded classes in this section specified."

Mr. RUCKER. That amendment will perfect that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous

consent to return to that section for the purpose of offering the following amendment, which I will ask to have read.

The clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding at the end of line 7, page 3, the words "and habitual drunkards."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to return to section 2 of the bill for the purpose of offering the amendment which the clerk has read. Is there objection?

Mr. SHATTUC. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio objects. The Chair will state that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama is a new section, known as section 3. The Clerk will now proceed to read section 3 of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the importation into the United States of any woman for the purposes of prostitution is hereby forbidden; and whoever shall knowingly and willfully import or attempt to import any woman into the United States for the purposes of prostitution, or shall knowingly or willfully hold or attempt to hold any woman for such purposes in pursuance of such illegal importation or contract or agreement, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and, on conviction thereof, shall be imprisoned not less than one nor more than five years and pay a fine not exceeding \$5,000.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk, to come in as two independent sections. The Clerk read as follows:

Amend between lines 24 and 25, page 4, by adding two sections, as follows:

"SEC. 4. That it shall hereafter be unlawful for any male alien who has not in good faith made his declaration before the proper court of his intention to become a citizen of the United States to be employed on any public works of the United States, or to come regularly or habitually into the United States by land or water for the purpose of engaging in any mechanical trade or manual labor, for wages or salary, returning from time to time to a foreign country.

"SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, company, or corporation knowingly to employ any alien coming into the United States in violation of the next preceding section of this act: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to the employment of sailors, deck hands, or other employees of vessels, or railroad train hands, such as conductors, engineers, brakemen, firemen, or baggagemen, whose duties require them to pass over the frontier to reach the termini of their runs, or to boatmen or guides on the lakes and rivers on the northern border of the United States, or citizens of countries in North America."

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, that amendment, with the exception of the last three or four words—

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Immigration, has already reserved a point of order.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a parliamentary inquiry. What is the parliamentary situation? If I understand it, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SNOODGRASS] offered an additional section. Now, the gentleman from Michigan offers two additional sections. His amendment is not an amendment to the one offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Iowa that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee was a section before section 3 of the bill. Section 3 of the bill has now been read. No amendment being offered to that section, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] was recognized to offer an amendment covering two sections to follow section 3 of the bill.

Mr. HEPBURN. I thought some gentleman offered the substitute previously offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMT] as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. That was voted down.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Michigan can not offer two sections at once.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state, in response to the gentleman from Illinois, that a division may be demanded on the amendment and only one section be voted on at a time.

Mr. CORLISS. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman. That amendment, with the exception of the last three or four words, is identical with the bill that passed this House and the Senate in the Fifty-fourth Congress. It covers the two sections having reference to what are known as "birds of passage." Now, it was shown in the debate on that bill in the Fifty-fourth Congress that many thousands of able-bodied men, who are aliens, come to this country between the 1st of March and the 1st of December every year, many of them skilled artisans, earning in the aggregate millions of dollars, and, having families in foreign lands, take the fruits of labor in this country to their foreign homes at the end of each labor season. It was shown by the statistics from the immigration department that from 50,000 to 75,000 persons in different years come for that purpose.

These two sections were incorporated in that bill, and I have cut them out bodily. That bill was vetoed by President Cleveland. I have amended the section by adding the words "or citizens of countries of North America," making an exception of such persons. I want the Clerk to read the reference of Presi-

dent Cleveland to this paragraph, showing the only objection that he made to this provision. As will be observed, President Cleveland's only objection was that the provision barred out citizens of adjoining countries, and I have eliminated that feature.

The Clerk read as follows:

When we consider these provisions of the bill in connection with our long northern frontier and the boundaries of our States and Territories, often but an imaginary line separating them from the British Dominion, and recall the friendly intercourse between the people who are neighbors on either side, the provisions of this bill affecting them must be regarded as illiberal, narrow, and un-American.

The residents of these States and Territories have separate and especial interests which in many cases make an interchange of labor between their people and their alien neighbors most important, frequently with the advantage largely in favor of our citizens. This suggests the inexpediency of Federal interference with these conditions when not necessary to the correction of a substantial evil affecting the general welfare. Such unfriendly legislation as is proposed could hardly fail to provoke retaliatory measures, to the injury of many of our citizens who now find employment on adjoining foreign soil.

Mr. CORLISS. Now, Mr. Chairman, President Cleveland called attention to the possible evil of the bill in that it might affect citizens of Canada and Mexico, countries contiguous to our own. That was the only objection he made to the paragraph. In the amendment that I have offered I expressly except citizens of countries adjoining ours in North America.

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CORLISS. Yes.

Mr. HEPBURN. If you have excepted all on our northern and southern borders, who are left?

Mr. CORLISS. I will say to the gentleman that I have statistics from the Immigration Bureau which show that not less than 15,000 Europeans come into the port of New York and into Boston Harbor every spring and engage work about the coast as stone masons, bricklayers, and carpenters, as skilled artisans, earning from \$2 to \$5 a day, and at the end of the season they take the fruits of such labor to their foreign homes on foreign soil; every American labor organization in this country has asked Congress to recognize this evil and to stop it. You say you desire to stop immigration. Here is an opportunity to protect American labor, and American labor has asked us to unite on some immigration bill that will stop foreign aliens, nonresidents, from coming here to compete with him on our soil. This provision will protect them.

Mr. HEPBURN. I agree with what the gentleman stated, but these come from European points.

Mr. CORLISS. That is all my amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN (continuing.) But why exempt the Canadians and why exempt the Mexicans, when ten come from Canada to the United States for one that comes from a foreign port?

Mr. CORLISS. There is a good reason for exempting Canadians and Mexicans, because American interests are closely allied with theirs. The conditions by water and by rail are such as to necessitate a constant exchange of American citizens with Canadians. It does not particularly interfere with or menace the earnings of the laborer, as it did some years ago, not near as much, because the overflow of Canada is here now. Many young men of Canada have moved to our country and make the best citizens. Now, we want to stop the foreigner, the man in Europe and other lands, from coming here.

Mr. HEPBURN. In this debate from time to time I have heard the statement made that hundreds of thousands of Canadians come from Canada in the morning, take the place of some laborers of the United States during the day, and at night go back with the money and spend it over there.

Mr. CORLISS. Undoubtedly to some extent that is true; and it is true in my city and at Buffalo; but our citizens go there, and there is a distinction in effect that was seen and recognized; and appreciating the interest of labor, I have offered this amendment which eliminates the only possible objection that can be to it. It may interfere with the American citizens in Canada and in Mexico and not permit the free exchange between citizens of the United States and citizens of Canada, and between citizens of Mexico and the citizens of the United States, but it reaches the element which is the most dangerous and menacing to the labor of our country.

I can show you, for I have the statistics certified to by the immigration commissioner at Boston and New York, that 15,000 in one year entered those harbors and engaged employment as skilled laborers; that 75 per cent of them were men with families. I had the names of several who lived in Scotland and who every year for nearly fifteen years left their families in Scotland and came to the city of Boston and there worked in one factory as stone-cutters. They got \$5 a day. They were the best artisans of their trade. They did not live in this country. Their families were in Scotland. I had the names and the addresses and the facts to show that these men came here and engaged in work for four or

five months, living in boarding houses, cheap places, and taking the fruits of their labor in America back to their foreign families on foreign soil and there educate their children and there purchase the supplies necessary to support their families.

I want the House to recognize the interests of American labor, who have asked repeatedly for this provision and who protested against the veto. To avoid any complications I have added the exception with reference to citizens of the two countries, Canada and Mexico, and I sincerely hope that there will be no objection to this provision.

Mr. WEEKS. Men come from Windsor over to Detroit to find employment there, and I would like to ask if the gentleman's amendment covers that?

Mr. CORLISS. It does not affect that question at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] by striking out the words "citizens of any country in North America." If there is any wisdom at all in the amendment that the gentleman has offered, and I think there is, it consists in this: That no foreign citizen that has no intention of becoming an American citizen shall come here and crowd an American laborer out of his job and take the proceeds of his labor back to his foreign home and enjoy them there. If that is a sound position, and I think it is, no man can give a good reason why a Canadian or a Mexican shall be permitted to cross the border, come here and earn wages, crowd out an American laborer and take his wages back to his foreign home and enjoy them in Canada or Mexico any more than he can come over from England, Germany, Russia, or the Lord knows where.

Indeed, the reason of the rule applies more to Canadians and Mexicans than it does to the other nationalities, because it is easier for them to get in here; and the proposition of the gentleman from Michigan illustrates the evil of making exceptions to the general rule. If you say that no foreigner shall come here, crowd out one of our laborers and take his earnings out of the country—and they do it by the thousands—you can go before an intelligent constituency and stand on it, but I would like very much to see any man in this House address an intelligent audience in the United States and undertake to defend the proposition that foreign laborers not intending to become citizens shall come in and crowd out an American from his job and take his wages away from him, unless they be Canadians or unless they be Mexicans, in which two cases they may come in ad libitum.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. CORLISS. Are you not aware that the character of the laborer and his wages in Canada are relatively very much higher than the laborer of Europe?

Mr. CLARK. That may be true.

Mr. CORLISS. And that the demand for labor in Canada is much higher, and that therefore the danger of the laborer from European competition is greater than that of Canada?

Mr. CLARK. That is partly true and partly not true. The traditional American position is in favor of welcoming honest, industrious, moral, healthy, law-abiding white people who come to this country to become citizens and establish homes—to remain here and to become part and parcel of us. Many of our best citizens are foreign-born persons and their children; but the laborers of this country do not believe anybody who does not intend to become an American citizen has a right to come over here and stay and labor in this country and earn wages and take them back to the foreign country and there spend them.

If you would add this amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, as amended by my amendment, to this bill it will keep out nine-tenths of the undesirable people that come to this country simply to make money without becoming citizens, because the statistics of the last census show, notwithstanding the flood of immigration in the country, in 1900 there were fewer people in the country of foreign birth, and fewer people one remove from foreign birth, than there were in 1880; and there is not a man living that can give any reason for an exception to this proposition in favor of Canadians and Mexicans.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I want to be consistent, and I want to pass this bill. This putting on of so many riders will have a tendency to hurt the bill. Without discussing the merits of these amendments I want to get rid of them, because I want the bill to finally pass the House and the Senate, and therefore I insist on the point of order that the amendments are not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] submits an amendment, or rather two amendments, in the form of two sections, to which the point of order was made and reserved by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC]. The debate has been exhausted, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] calls for a decision on the point of order.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the point of order, but I want to address myself to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri for the moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first dispose of the point of order made upon these two amendments. The bill before the House is a bill regulating the immigration of aliens into the United States. The scope of the measure is exceedingly broad, and any amendment relating directly to the general scope and intent of the bill would be germane.

These amendments bring in an entirely new subject not alluded to in the bill, but relating to contract labor and contract-labor laws. If the Chair did not feel convinced in his own mind on this point of order, he would feel inclined to follow the decision made by Mr. Speaker Reed in the Fifty-fourth Congress, which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] will undoubtedly recall. On an immigration bill similar to the pending bill amendments similar to the pending amendments were offered, and points of order were made against them. The points of order were sustained by Mr. Reed on the ground that the amendments relating to contract labor were not germane to an immigration bill. In view of the precedent established by Mr. Speaker Reed, and in accordance with what seems to the Chair to be correct parliamentary practice, the point of order is sustained on the ground that the amendments are not germane to the subject-matter of the bill.

Mr. SHATTUC. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOUTELL reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12199) to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States and had come to no resolution thereon.

NATIONAL SANITARIUM AT SOLDIERS' HOME, HOT SPRINGS.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, by unanimous consent, called up from the Speaker's table the following concurrent resolution of the Senate; which was read, considered, and adopted.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Committee on Enrolled Bills, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 586) for the establishment, control, operation, and maintenance of a national sanitarium of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers at Hot Springs, in the State of South Dakota, are hereby authorized to strike out the words "Branch Home" from line 12, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the word "sanitarium."

LIFE-SAVING STATION AT MONOMOY ISLAND, MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. LOVERING. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 13168) to establish an additional life-saving station on Monomoy Island, Massachusetts.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish an additional life-saving station on Monomoy Island, Massachusetts, at such point as the General Superintendent of the Life-Saving Service may recommend.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Has this bill been reported by any committee of the House?

Mr. LOVERING. It has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I should like to know how much expense is involved?

Mr. LOVERING. Practically no expense. It is simply for the reestablishment of a station which it was contemplated to abandon, but recent disasters have proved that it is necessary to have this station reestablished.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The bill provides for no expenditure whatever, as I understand.

Mr. LOVERING. None but for mere repairs. That is all.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What is the necessity, may I ask, for the passage of the bill?

Mr. LOVERING. The necessity for the reestablishment of this station grows out of the recent disaster at Monomoy Island, where 12 lives were lost. It has been proved that had this station been in operation at the time there would have been no loss of life. There were more lives and more property rescued on this island than at any other point in the whole United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. LOVERING. I ask unanimous consent that a bill which has passed the Senate, absolutely identical with this House bill, be substituted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. As I understand, the Senate bill is identical?

Mr. LOVERING. It is.

The SPEAKER. Has the Senate bill been reported back from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce? It does not seem to be in the possession of the Clerk.

Mr. LOVERING. Then I ask that the House bill be passed. The question being taken, the bill of the House was passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS SAVANNAH RIVER.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill No. 5406.

The bill (S. 5406) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Savannah River from the mainland of Aiken County, S. C., to the mainland of Richmond County, Ga., was read.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. MERCER. I ask unanimous consent that the House non-concur in the amendments of the Senate to House bill 14018, the public-buildings bill.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. MERCER, Mr. GILLET of New York, and Mr. BANKHEAD as conferees on the part of the House.

COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS.

The SPEAKER announced the following committee assignments:

District of Columbia—Mr. McANDREWS of Illinois.

Library—Mr. McCLELLAN of New York.

Labor—Mr. RYAN of New York.

Expenditures in the Department of Justice—Mr. STEPHENS of Texas.

Immigration and Naturalization—Mr. FLOOD of Virginia.

Claims—Mr. GOOCH of Kentucky, and Mr. RHEA of Virginia.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. RANDELL of Texas, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. GAINES of West Virginia, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SCOTT, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois, for this week, on account of illness.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSE RULES.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee calls up the following privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to whom was referred the resolution numbered 266, have had the same under consideration and report in lieu thereof the following:

"Resolved, That the following be added to the rules of the House as section 2 of Rule XXIX:

"It shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the RECORD, except on either of the six days preceding the end of a session."

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this substitute is for the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. It simply provides that conference reports must be first printed in the daily RECORD before they are to be called up for consideration in the House. It does not affect their privileged character when called up, but simply postpones their consideration until they shall have been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The exception is made in favor of the last six days of the session, because at that time it is supposed we may be more or less hurried, and the exception is made that those reports will not have to be first printed.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. McRAE. I would ask if the gentleman does not think, if we are to have these printed, that they should be printed in bill form. Printing a report in the RECORD does not show us at once what the committee has done.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. We not only print the report in the RECORD, but the rule requires the printing of the accompanying statement.

Mr. McRAE. When a long conference report is printed in the RECORD, it often takes a man half a day to get at what is done. In bill form it would be of some use to us. I think the printing of it would be of no benefit practically unless it is printed in bill form, to show what is done and proposed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would state to my friend from Arkansas that the object of printing the report in the RECORD is to call the attention of the House to what the conferees have done.

Mr. McRAE. I understand that, yes; but unless attention is called to what is done by printing the amendments and changes proposed we can not tell whether the report is correct or not.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It is right there for them to see.

Mr. McRAE. You may take a conference report on any of the large appropriation bills, and I undertake to say there are not ten men in the House who in half a day can tell what it means by reading the report in the RECORD. It will take considerable time to ascertain what these amendments mean unless they are printed in bill form in connection with the text of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. The gentleman will observe that this requires the printing of the accompanying statement, and it is the statement which gives the information, anyway, as to what the report of the conferees includes. I think there will be no difficulty. It will be just as easy to make the comparison with the printed copy in the RECORD as if it were in bill form.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Does this provide that the conference report shall be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Upon presentation, without asking unanimous consent?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. They shall be printed; yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Does it say they shall be printed in the RECORD? Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will ask that the Clerk report the rule again. I so understood it.

Mr. CANNON. They are always printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. They are when called up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the Clerk will again report the resolution.

The Clerk again read the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Upon presentation of a conference report, is it a matter of right that it shall be printed in the RECORD, without an order of the House?

The SPEAKER. It is an absolute duty under this rule, the Chair thinks.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. It can not be considered until it is.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] if the exception there is not too ample. Originally, as the resolution was introduced, it made an exception of those reports that were made during the last three days of the session, and the reason for that was the statement that often the business was perhaps purposely delayed on the part of some person until the last few days for the very purpose, possibly, of the House not having as full an understanding as it otherwise might. I do not know that that was his language, but it was the inference that I drew, and I am fearful that as the rush comes just at the last we are going to have too much room in that exception, and I would prefer the resolution as it originally read.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understand that the question is addressed to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. The resolution says six days. Now, in the last six days it is in order to move to suspend the rules, as the gentleman is aware. I do not consider it very important whether it is three days or six days. I should have been entirely content if it had been three days instead of six, because if there had been any special pressure the House undoubtedly would suspend the rules for the first three days of the six. There is an abuse almost unavoidable that is liable to happen in the last six days or the last three days of the session, when everything is crowding for consideration, and you do as much business ordinarily in six days as you would do in a month or six weeks at another stage of the session. I would be perfectly willing to see it three days instead of six.

Mr. LACEY. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman in charge of the measure to one possible difficulty, and ask him what he thinks about this: In the last Congress, if I remember right, there were no last six days. There was only one of those days.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. You mean in the long session?

Mr. LACEY. In the long session. In other words, in the long session, until a resolution of adjournment has passed the two Houses, we do not know when the six days will begin, and in the last long session we did not agree to the adjournment resolution until the last day. Consequently, there were no last six days. Might this not give us some trouble?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will state to the gentleman that the Committee on Rules considered that very carefully.

That was suggested while the committee were considering this proposed rule, and we thought that if the difficulty which the gentleman from Iowa suggests should arise that the Committee on Rules could very well bring in a proposition to vacate this rule during the remainder of the session. We could obviate the difficulty by simply bringing in a rule abrogating this rule for the remainder of the session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had presented this day to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

H. R. 307. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Branson;

H. R. 671. An act granting an increase of pension to Orra H. Heath;

H. R. 1046. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin;

H. R. 1129. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Shaffer;

H. R. 1695. An act granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Perry;

H. R. 1696. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick A. Condon;

H. R. 1715. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry P. Hudson, formerly Henry P. Dow;

H. R. 1724. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel F. Thompson;

H. R. 2661. An act granting an increase of pension to Oswald Ahlstedt;

H. R. 2563. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Strong;

H. R. 3238. An act granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Weeks;

H. R. 3292. An act granting an increase of pension to Arthur H. Perkins;

H. R. 4451. An act granting an increase of pension to George K. Thompson;

H. R. 5020. An act granting an increase of pension to Courtland C. Matson;

H. R. 5219. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Donne;

H. R. 5865. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Campbell;

H. R. 5911. An act granting an increase of pension to Gilbert G. Gabrion;

H. R. 6063. An act granting an increase of pension to John Brill;

H. R. 6172. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Weimer;

H. R. 6721. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Ray;

H. R. 6750. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Hoxie;

H. R. 7228. An act granting an increase of pension to Christian Christianson;

H. R. 7229. An act granting an increase of pension to Edwin M. Dunning;

H. R. 7401. An act granting an increase of pension to William Brown;

H. R. 7897. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Daly;

H. R. 7918. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Pettee;

H. R. 8106. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel J. Mahoney;

H. R. 8401. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Murphy;

H. R. 8409. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrenus Larrabee;

H. R. 10488. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate W. Milward;

H. R. 10821. An act granting an increase of pension to Abby T. Daniels;

H. R. 11133. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Lafferty;

H. R. 11170. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kunselman;

H. R. 12978. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Smith;

H. R. 13019. An act granting an increase of pension to Marietta Elizabeth Stanton;

H. R. 13036. An act granting an increase of pension to John B. Greenhalgh;

H. R. 13371. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Palmer;

H. R. 12054. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Burrill;

H. R. 750. An act granting a pension to Martin Essex;

H. R. 3829. An act granting a pension to Mary Ann Merrow;

H. R. 4089. An act granting a pension to Ada L. McFarland;

H. R. 4204. An act granting a pension to Hester A. Furr;

H. R. 5553. An act granting a pension to Nancy E. Hardy;

H. R. 5554. An act granting a pension to Egbert A. Stricksma;

H. R. 6021. An act granting a pension to William Kaste;

H. R. 6663. An act granting a pension to John York;

H. R. 7085. An act granting a pension to Hannah H. Graham;

H. R. 7541. An act granting a pension to Annie Shinn;

H. R. 8341. An act granting a pension Hannah C. Chase; and

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution fixing the time when a certain provision of the Indian appropriation act for the year ending June 30, 1903, shall take effect.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER also, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8587. An act for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8466. An act granting a pension to Lucinda A. Sirwell;

H. R. 8921. An act granting increase of pension to Jesse C. Rhodabeck;

H. R. 9226. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth I. Ogden;

H. R. 9249. An act granting a pension to Amos Allport;

H. R. 9437. An act granting increase of pension to Elias A. Calkins;

H. R. 9569. An act granting increase of pension to Albert Deits;

H. R. 9926. An act granting increase of pension to James F. Patton;

H. R. 9928. An act granting a pension to Benjamin E. Styles;

H. R. 10165. An act granting increase of pension to Delia E. Slocum;

H. R. 10201. An act granting increase of pension to Otis R. Freeman;

H. R. 10731. An act granting increase of pension to Samuel P. Milburn;

H. R. 11285. An act granting increase of pension to William Sheldon;

H. R. 11343. An act granting a pension to Mary Louise Lowry;

H. R. 11644. An act granting increase of pension to Edgar A. Hamilton;

H. R. 11921. An act granting increase of pension to George W. De Graw;

H. R. 12012. An act granting increase of pension to Walter C. Tuttle;

H. R. 12458. An act granting increase of pension to William M. Barstow;

H. R. 12685. An act granting a pension to Hiram J. Springfield;

H. R. 12778. An act granting increase of pension to Edward R. Blain;

H. R. 12780. An act granting increase of pension to William H. Wheeler;

H. R. 13132. An act granting increase of pension to Annie Cotter;

H. R. 13162. An act granting increase of pension to Augustin M. Adams;

H. R. 13249. An act granting increase of pension to Ada Trowbridge;

H. R. 13266. An act granting increase of pension to Elbert M. Remson;

H. R. 13265. An act granting increase of pension to John Whalen;

H. R. 13350. An act granting a pension to Presley P. Medlin;

H. R. 13503. An act granting increase of pension to Charles Haltenhof;

H. R. 13807. An act granting a pension to Jeremiah Horan;

H. R. 13822. An act granting a pension to Hannah T. Knowles;

H. R. 14099. An act granting a pension to Samantha B. Van Brocklin; and

H. R. 12562. An act granting increase of pension to William H. Temple.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

S. 3848. An act granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain lands in the city of Newport, R. I.;

S. 3129. An act for the authorization of the erection of buildings by the International Committee of Young Men's Christian Associations on military reservations of the United States;

S. 3666. An act to authorize the sale of a part of the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, in the State of Nebraska;

S. R. 46. Joint resolution to provide for the printing of 6,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1901, inclusive; and

S. 173. An act for the relief of the owners of the British ship Foscolia and cargo.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for various deficiencies—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of Spencer Vaughan, administrator of estate of Asa Tucker, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. PARKER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11656) to incorporate The Society of the Army of Santiago de Cuba, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2187); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3108) to provide a home for aged and infirm colored people, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2188); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MUDD, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 87) to permit steam railroads in the District of Columbia to occupy additional parts of streets in order to accommodate the traveling public attending the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in October, 1902, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2191); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 493) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2192); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PATTERSON of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13233) granting a pension to William A. Nelson, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2174); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13178) granting a pension to William F. Bowden, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2175); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROMWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8644) granting a pension to John W. Thomas, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2176); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11893) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Dennis, of Turin, Coweta County, Ga., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2177); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14224) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Tod, reported the same with

amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2178); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BALL of Texas, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14251) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Reynolds, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2179); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SELBY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14234) granting a pension to John Williamson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2180); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRAPER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14359) granting a pension to Luther G. Edwards, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2181); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2783) granting a pension to William Dixon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2182); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5202) granting an increase of pension to Jennie M. Wagner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2183); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5152) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus M. M. Martin, alias Marion M. Martin, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2184); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13683) granting an increase of pension to Ella S. Mannix, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2185); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2186) granting an increase of pension to Hattie M. Whitney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2186); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13536) for the payment of C. Edward Artist, Edward F. Stahle, and Stahle & Artist of balances due for surveying public lands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2189); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6414) granting an increase of pension to William W. H. Davis, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2190); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 14644) for the erection of an equestrian statue to the memory of Baron Steuben at Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LOVERING: A bill (H. R. 14645) to amend chapter 11 of the laws of 1897, entitled "An act to provide revenue for the Government and to encourage the industries of the United States"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON: A bill (H. R. 14647) relating to future contracts in agricultural products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LATIMER: A bill (H. R. 14648) for the relief of the Interstate and West Indian Exposition, in the city of Charleston, S. C.—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14690) providing for the erection of a monument at Cowpens battle ground, Cherokee County, S. C., commemorative of Gen. Daniel Morgan and those who participated in the battle of Cowpens on the 30th day of January, 1781—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LACEY: A concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 52) to rescind the passage of House concurrent resolution No. 15, authorizing the printing of "The Morals of Jesus of Nazareth," by Thomas Jefferson—to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. METCALF: A bill (H. R. 14646) to renew and extend certain letters patent—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 14649) granting a pension to Dilana B. Fitts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 14650) granting a pension to Francis M. Hassler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 14651) granting a pension to Rudolph Kals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida: A bill (H. R. 14652) granting an increase of pension to Thomas I. Madge—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 14653) granting an increase of pension to William L. Reck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KYLE: A bill (H. R. 14654) granting an increase of pension to John Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 14655) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14656) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Scott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: A bill (H. R. 14657) granting a pension to Mrs. M. A. Durkee—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14658) granting a pension to John M. Leader—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14659) granting a pension to Harriett A. Tappan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14660) granting an increase of pension to Mary (Fox) Everett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14661) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. Benjamin C. Harter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14662) granting an increase of pension to John Dick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14663) granting an increase of pension to James F. Cosgro—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14664) granting an increase of pension to James Ferguson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14665) granting an increase of pension to William W. Herron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14666) granting an increase of pension to John Tanner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14667) granting an increase of pension to John H. Volckmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14668) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Small—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14669) granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Charnock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14670) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Heaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14671) granting an increase of pension to Franklin De R. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14672) granting an increase of pension to G. K. Glenn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14673) granting an increase of pension to Albert E. Meigs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14674) for the relief of Sarah A. Cady—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14675) to correct the military record of Henry S. Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14676) to correct the military record of Peter L. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14677) to correct the military record of George Hare, alias Frank Waters, alias George F. Waters—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14678) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Sullivan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14679) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Charles R. Stevens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14680) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Fairman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14681) to remove charge of desertion against Benjamin F. Moore, alias Henry F. Hunt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 14682) granting a pension to Georgiana Ballard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14683) granting a pension to Rosa Gudgeon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14684) granting an increase of pension to David W. Swigert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14685) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Madison Waldron—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14686) for the relief of John Till—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 14687) granting a pension to Margaret Brennan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 14688) granting a pension to Harriet S. Packard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 14689) to grant American registry to the steamship Arab—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of bill (H. R. 10793) forbidding railroad officials to separate passengers on account of race or color—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROMWELL: Petition of H. Lachtrop and other citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging the passage of a service pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: Statement of Rev. G. E. Strobbridge, relative to the status of chaplains of the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: Resolution of W. M. Rogers Post, No. 159, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ladelle, S. Dak., favoring the construction of Government vessels in navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CROMER: Resolutions of Trades Council of Anderson, Ind., favoring an educational qualification for immigrants—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of Roosevelt Republican Club, of Yonkers, N. Y., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Resolutions of Central Federated Union, indorsing bill to prohibit enlisted men in the service of the United States competing with civilians—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, resolutions of the New York Produce Exchange, Stereotypers' Union No. 1, Social Reform Club, New Century Club, and Chambre de Commerce Française, of New York City, indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Resolutions of Melville Thomas Post, No. 515, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, in support of House bill granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Kennedy—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HANBURY: Papers to accompany House bill 14480, to remove the charge of desertion against the record of George W. Smith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IRWIN: Paper to accompany House bill 3742, granting an increase of pension to Lafayette L. Griffiths—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Louisville, Ky., in favor of House bills 178 and 179, for the repeal of the tax on distilled spirits—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 12318, to correct the military record of Conrad Brandaberry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON: Petition of A. B. Woodruff and 49 other citizens of South Carolina, praying for cheaper postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: Petitions of Commercial Dock Store, Tacoma Fish Company, R. W. Jamieson, and others, of Tacoma, Wash., in relation to gasoline-propelled launches—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolution of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, urging the passage of House bill 163, to pension employees and dependents of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, in favor of a law to pension men of Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 14032, granting a pension to Gustav Jansen—to the Committee on Pension.

Also, resolution of Merchants' Association of San Francisco, favoring the payment of the claims of Hawaiian citizens whose property was destroyed in the effort to stamp out the bubonic plague in 1899 and 1900—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KNOX: Petition of Bottlers' Union No. 190, of Lawrence, Mass., for the restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MAYNARD: Petition of Ocean Lodge, No. 76, Locomotive Firemen, Norfolk, Va., for the further restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Resolutions of the trustees of the Free Public Library of Hoboken, N. J., indorsing House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McLACHLAN: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the correction of the military record of P. L. Moore—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers in support of House bill granting a pension to Mary Fox, now Everett—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERCER: Papers to accompany House bill 12570, granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Beezley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill 12516, granting a pension to J. H. Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUTCHLER: Resolutions of Carpenters' Union No. 501, of East Stroudsburg, Pa., favoring the Chinese-exclusion act—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of F. W. Bell Circle, No. 107, Easton, Pa., Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, favoring the passage of House bill 3067—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of General J. Kilpatrick Post, No. 233, Sons of Veterans, Easton, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill 6279, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of United Mine Workers' Unions Nos. 1595, of Beaver Meadow; 1494, of Colerain, and 1745, of Summit Hill, Pa., favoring the prohibition of immigrants other than wives and children who can not read—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of Abraham Heed and others, of Montgomery County, Ohio, favoring the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Papers to accompany House bill 14631, granting an increase of pension to Henry Jeffers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John Till, of Lauderdale County, Ala., for reference of war claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolution of Central Federated Union of New York, in reference to the employment of enlisted men in competition with local civilians—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of citizens of Kane, Pa., and other places, asking that certain kinds of meat be placed upon the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Journeymen Barbers' Union of Glade Run, Pa., in relation to immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of Central Federated Union of New York, indorsing the bill prohibiting enlisted men in the service of the United States competing with civilians—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. THAYER: Petition of Justus H. Wright and others, in the State of Massachusetts, in relation to jurors' fees in the United States courts—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Dudley Donnelly Post, No. 133, of Niagara Falls, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, for the passage of a bill to modify and simplify the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZENOR: Petition of 570 members of the Union Veteran Legion of Floyd County, Ind., praying for the passage of the per diem pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (by request), petition of Cherokee Nation, praying for appropriation to pay claim against the United States, in compliance with findings of Court of Claims—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 23, 1902.

Prayer by Rev. F. J. PRETTYMAN, of the city of Washington.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

DISTRICT INDUSTRIAL HOME SCHOOL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut) laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting an estimate of appropriation in the additional sum of \$3,000 for the enlargement of the girls' dormitories of the Industrial Home School, District of Columbia, together with the reappropriation of \$5,000 for this purpose, provided by the District appropriation act of March 1, 1901; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER announced his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

A bill (S. 173) for the relief of the owners of the British ship Foscolia and cargo;

A bill (S. 3129) for the authorization of the erection of buildings by the international committee of Young Men's Christian Associations on military reservations of the United States;

A bill (S. 3666) to authorize the sale of a part of the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation, in the State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 3848) granting a deed of quitclaim and release to Lorillard Spencer, his heirs and assigns, of all the right, title, and interest in and to certain land in the city of Newport, R. I.;

A bill (H. R. 8466) granting a pension to Lucinda A. Sirwell;

A bill (H. R. 8587) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8921) granting increase of pension to Jesse C. Rhodaback;

A bill (H. R. 9226) granting a pension to Elizabeth I. Ogden;

A bill (H. R. 9249) granting a pension to Amos Allport;

A bill (H. R. 9437) granting increase of pension to Elias A. Calkins;

A bill (H. R. 9569) granting increase of pension to Albert Deits;

A bill (H. R. 9926) granting increase of pension to James F. Patton;

A bill (H. R. 9928) granting a pension to Benjamin E. Styles;

A bill (H. R. 10165) granting increase of pension to Delia E. Slocum;

A bill (H. R. 10201) granting increase of pension to Otis R. Freeman;

A bill (H. R. 10731) granting increase of pension to Samuel P. Milburn;

A bill (H. R. 11285) granting increase of pension to William Sheldon;

A bill (H. R. 11343) granting a pension to Mary Louise Lowry;

A bill (H. R. 11644) granting a pension to Edgar A. Hamilton;

A bill (H. R. 11921) granting increase of pension to George W. De Graw;

A bill (H. R. 12012) granting increase of pension to Walter C. Tuttle;

A bill (H. R. 12453) granting increase of pension to William M. Barstow;

A bill (H. R. 12562) granting increase of pension to William H. Temple;

A bill (H. R. 12685) granting a pension to Hiram J. Springfield;

A bill (H. R. 12778) granting increase of pension to Edward R. Blain;

A bill (H. R. 12780) granting increase of pension to William H. Wheeler;

A bill (H. R. 13132) granting increase of pension to Annie Cotter;

A bill (H. R. 13162) granting increase of pension to Augustin M. Adams;

A bill (H. R. 13249) granting increase of pension to Ada Trowbridge;

A bill (H. R. 13265) granting increase of pension to John Whalen;

A bill (H. R. 13268) granting increase of pension to Elbert N. Remson;

A bill (H. R. 13350) granting a pension to Presley P. Medlin;

A bill (H. R. 13503) granting increase of pension to Charles Haltenhof;

A bill (H. R. 13807) granting a pension to Jeremiah Horan;

A bill (H. R. 13822) granting a pension to Hannah T. Knowles;

A bill (H. R. 14099) granting a pension to Samantha B. Van Brocklin; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 46) to provide for the printing of 6,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1901, inclusive.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented the petition of Owen Hoep and 31 other citizens of Ragged Top, S. Dak., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the internal-revenue law relative to the tax on distilled spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a petition of sundry citizens of Fairhaven, Vt., praying for the repeal of the tariff duties on beef, veal, mutton, and pork; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of Lumpers, Boxers, and Derrick Men's Local Union No. 9584, American Federation of Labor, of Barre, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. FOSTER of Washington presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of